

Journal

The LUTHERAN C H U R C H QUARTERLY

VOLUME XV

APRIL, 1942

NUMBER 2

A RE-APPRAISAL OF LUTHERAN UNITY

By Otto W. Heick

THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN INDIA

By J. Roy Strock

OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS IN THE MINISTRY

By Luther S. Straley

Inspiration and the Pittsburgh Agreement.....*By Henry Grady Davis*
Trends in Recent Theology.....*By John Aberly*
Gregory Heimburg, Medieval Conciliarist.....*By Ernest D. Nielsen*
The Common Basis for Jews and Gentiles.....*By E. Gomann*
The Medieval Preacher's Inattentive Congregation.....*By Theodore G. Tappert*

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

TIMES AND NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CONTENTS FOR APRIL

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE	102
--------------------------------------	-----

ARTICLES

A RE-APPRAISAL OF LUTHERAN UNITY. <i>By Otto W. Heick</i>	103
THE PLANTING OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN INDIA. <i>By J. Roy Strock</i>	123
OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS IN THE MINISTRY. <i>By Luther S. Straley</i>	139

NOTES AND STUDIES

INSPIRATION AND THE PITTSBURGH AGREEMENT. <i>By Henry Grady Davis</i>	154
TRENDS IN RECENT THEOLOGY. <i>By John Aberly</i>	157
GREGORY HEIMBURG, A FIFTEENTH CENTURY CONCILIARIST. <i>By Ernest D. Nielsen</i>	163
LIFE AND SALVATION—THE COMMON BASIS FOR JEWS AND GENTILES. <i>By E. Gomann</i>	174
THE MEDIEVAL PREACHER AND HIS INATTENTIVE CONGREGATION. <i>By Theodore G. Tappert</i>	180

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

Smith, <i>Faith and Nurture</i> (O. F. Nolde)	186
Hewitt, <i>God's Back Pasture</i> (M. Schroeder)	188
Robinson, <i>Jesus in Action</i> (R. T. Stamm)	189
Scott, <i>The Nature of the Early Church</i> (H. Offermann)	191
Burrows, <i>What Mean These Stones?</i> (C. U. Wolf)	192
Pfeiffer, <i>Introduction to the Old Testament</i> (J. M. Myers)	193
Noordtzy-Stearns, <i>The Old Testament Problem</i> (C. M. Cooper)	194
Wieman, <i>Now We Must Choose</i> (L. R. Tabor)	194
Leys, <i>Ethics and Social Policy</i> (T. A. Kantonen)	195
Boettner, <i>The Christian Attitude Toward War</i> (H. D. Hoover)	197
Fritz, <i>The Preacher's Manual</i> (H. F. Baughman)	198
Trexler, <i>A Pastor Wings Over South America</i> (W. G. Arbaugh)	198
Fiedler, <i>Then the Light Came</i> (W. H. Cooper)	199
Traver, <i>The Deacon and Worship</i> (H. E. Horn)	200
Gearhart, <i>The Keeper of the King's Inn</i> (W. R. Siegart)	200
Wiles, <i>The Lesson Commentary, 1942</i> (R. D. Hershey)	201
Swoyer, <i>The Saving Presence</i> (A. Yeagy)	201
Buttrick, <i>Prayer</i> (E. E. Fischer)	202
Hutchison, <i>We Are Not Divided</i> (J. R. Strevig)	203
Blegen, <i>Norwegian Migration to America</i> (T. G. Tappert)	204

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

Editors

Theodore G. Tappert
Emil E. Fischer
Philadelphia

Harvey D. Hoover
Raymond T. Stamm
Gettysburg

Volume XV

April, 1942

Number 2

Published quarterly by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly* (founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849) and *The Lutheran Church Review* (founded in Philadelphia in 1882). Entered at the Gettysburg Post Office as second-class matter.

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Subscription \$2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents. Subscriptions and all business communications should be addressed to Professor Harvey D. Hoover, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Manuscripts, books for review, and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to Professor Theodore G. Tappert, 7333 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The aims of THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY are (1) to give intellectual expression to the faith of the United Lutheran Church in America as set forth in its doctrinal basis, to maintain that faith, and to show constantly its relation to the practical religious living of those who hold it; (2) to promote cordial understandings between the bodies of Lutherans, both in America and Europe, and between Lutheran and other Christian groups; (3) to discuss, in a constructive and helpful manner, the relation of the faith of the Lutheran Church to the religious issues involved in contemporary life and thought.

The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they shall be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they shall be free from controversial animus; and that their contents shall be of real scholarly and practical value to the reader. THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY shall be conducted with due regard for the Christian liberty which proves all things and holds fast that which is good, and for which the Lutheran Church has always stood. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, will not of itself exclude articles from publication, since the editors will not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors. The editors reserve the right to reject any article without assigning a reason for their action.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

The name OTTO W. HEICK is already very familiar to readers of this journal. Dr. Heick is pastor of Christ Church in Ellis, Kansas.

A missionary on furlough from India, J. ROY STROCK has played a prominent part in the development of the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church, in India, an associate synod of the United Lutheran Church in America.

LUTHER S. STRALEY is pastor of Zion Church in Athens, New York.

HENRY GRADY DAVIS is professor of Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Chicago.

JOHN ABERLY is professor emeritus of Systematic Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary.

ERNEST D. NIELSEN is professor in Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa. This college is connected with the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

E. A. GOMANN is professor of Theology in the Lutheran College and Seminary, in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are: O. FREDERICK NOLDE, professor of Christian Education in the Philadelphia Seminary; MARTIN SCHROEDER, of Lincoln, Nebraska, rural work representative of the Board of American Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America; H. OFFERMANN, professor of New Testament Literature and Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; JACOB M. MYERS, instructor in the Old Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; CHARLES M. COOPER, assistant professor of the Old Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; L. RALPH TABOR, pastor of the Third Lutheran Church in Baltimore, Maryland; T. A. KANTONEN, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; HARRY F. BAUGHMAN, professor of the Art of Preaching in the Gettysburg Seminary; WILLIAM G. ARBAUGH, representative of the Board of American Missions, United Lutheran Church, in Puerto Rico; HENRY E. HORN, pastor of Immanuel Church in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; W. R. SIEGART, pastor of St. Matthew's Church in Reading, Pennsylvania; ARTHUR YEAGY, pastor of St. Paul's Church in Loganton, Pennsylvania.

A RE-APPRAISAL OF LUTHERAN UNITY

OTTO W. HEICK
Ellis, Kansas

SYNODICAL meetings and Lutheran periodicals are reverberating with discussions of Lutheran unity. Regarding the actual progress made in recent years toward the achievement of such unity, the readers of this paper are probably as well informed as the present writer. It may not be without value, however, to look at some of the points at issue from an angle that has not been much in evidence thus far. This paper is an attempt at such an approach. We shall discuss (1) the problem of altar and pulpit fellowship, and (2) some of the doctrinal issues in the conflict between the Missouri and Iowa synods on the one hand, and the United Lutheran Church on the other.

I

The problem of altar and pulpit fellowship involves, first, the relation of the Lutherans toward the non-Lutheran denominations, primarily to the different branches of the Reformed faith, and second, the attitude of the several Lutheran synods toward one another.

To begin with, let us briefly review historically how Muhlenberg Lutheranism dealt with this problem. Of the Patriarch and his co-laborers the church historians tell us that "the Pietistic tendencies of these men gave a certain color to their Lutheranism, but did not displace it" (H. E. Jacobs). "It is true," J. L. Neve writes, "that they exchanged pulpits with ministers of the Reformed denominations;" but all this, in the judgment of Jacobs, "is no evidence that these men had unionistic tendencies," for the practice of pulpit fellowship remained occasional and exceptional.¹ This attitude of the pioneers of our church underwent a strong modification during the next period. The men of the early Gen-

1 See Neve-Allbeck, *History of the Lutheran Church in America*, 1934, p. 60.

eral Synod did not hesitate to make the exchange of pulpits a regular practice. In justice to these fathers, we should remember that at the beginning of the nineteenth century English Deism and German rationalism had practically paralyzed the whole of western Christianity. Furthermore, the forming of the General Synod coincided with the proclamation of the Union in Prussia and other German states. Then came the religious revival which led to the rediscovery of the Lutheran Confessions in the Erlangen theology and in the so-called "theology of reipristination" (Philippi, Vilmar, *et al.*). Its effects on America can be seen in the founding of the synods of Missouri and of Iowa, and in the return to the Confessions within the Muhlenberg synods of the East as represented by Charles Porterfield Krauth with his great book, *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* (1872). While the "American Lutheranism" of S. S. Schmucker, B. Kurtz, and S. Sprecher reached its climax in the publication of the *Synodical Platform* (1855) and in the founding of the Franckean (1837) and Melancthon (1857) synods, the majority of the conservatives, after the disruption of the General Synod, gathered around the Confessional movement in the General Council. The Council expressed itself in Akron, Ohio (1872), and again in Galesburg, Illinois (1875), on what is generally known as the Galesburg Rule, "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran ministers only; Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only." The strictness of this rule, however, was modified, to some extent, by the additional resolutions adopted at Akron, which recognize the principle of exceptions (belonging to the "sphere of privilege, not of right"). The successor to the old Muhlenberg synods, the United Lutheran Church, virtually adopted the same position when, at the Omaha convention of 1940, it endorsed the so-called Pittsburgh Agreement, saying "that pastors and congregations shall not practice *indiscriminate* pulpit and altar fellowship with pastors and churches of other denominations, whereby doctrinal differences are ignored or virtually made matters of indifference."

Over against this elastic application of the Galesburg Rule, the synods affiliated with the Synodical Conference have taken their stand unreservedly on the principle that there cannot and shall not

be any altar or pulpit fellowship with members of the Reformed faith; for the peculiarities of the Reformed Confessions are looked upon, not as a possible understanding of the Scriptures different from the Lutheran interpretation, but as a perversion of Scriptural truth. The rigid application of this principle to all cases and circumstances where official agreement in doctrine has not been reached has led the Missourians to reject even occasional prayer fellowship with members of other denominations, or of Lutheran synods, outside the boundaries of the Conference. This attitude reveals a fundamental difference between the United Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod. When the former enjoins its pastors and congregations not to practice indiscriminate altar and pulpit fellowship with other church bodies, it has in mind denominations other than Lutheran, while it acknowledges that any group which accepts the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism as its doctrinal basis is entitled to the name "Lutheran" and worthy of unrestricted fellowship. Though the United Lutheran Church in its Constitution of 1918 recognized the other symbolical writings "as in harmony with one and the same pure Scriptural faith," it considers subscription to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as sufficient for church fellowship. The Missouri Synod, however, holds to the view that the name "Lutheran" requires unreserved subscription to the whole Book of Concord. (The theology of Missouri aims to be a theology of the Formula of Concord.) This exclusiveness is carried over into the *res externae* of church work. The Missourians have been firm in rejecting cooperation in externals with the Reformed bodies and are very reluctant about joining hands with other Lutherans in a common enterprise.

The position of the synods of the American Lutheran Conference is mediating. The American Lutheran Church, for example, in its Constitution of 1930 does not differentiate between the Augsburg Confession and the other symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. It is firm in rejecting the practice of pulpit and altar fellowship with the Reformed. It restricts, in principle, such fellowship to Lutheran synods with which it has reached an official agreement. But contrary to the Missouri Synod, the synods

united in the American Lutheran Conference have joined hands with the United Lutheran Church in America and the Lutherans of Europe in the work of the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran World Convention. They do not look upon fellowship in prayer and social service as acts of unionism.

This is briefly the historical position of the various Lutheran bodies. What shall be our criticism?

To pass a fair judgment requires understanding of the history of the church. It has become a commonplace with many Lutherans to make the old General Synod the scape-goat for all the faults in the Lutheran Church of America. But this is a gross injustice. In judging the General Synod we should keep in mind the general condition of the church in the early decades of the last century, as stated above. It was a period of Confessional disintegration. The theology of repristination and of Erlangen was not yet born. There was neither a Missouri Synod nor a Synod of Iowa. Yet during that age of Confessional indifference the General Synod, in the words of Jacobs, "must be regarded as a very important forward movement and its influence as beneficial.... The General Synod was a protest against the schemes of a union with the Reformed in Pennsylvania and with the Episcopalians in North Carolina. It stood for the independent existence of the Lutheran Church in America and the clear and unequivocal confession of a positive faith." This is a fine appraisal of the historical mission of the General Synod. The mistake made by Schmucker and his followers was that they wanted to continue the unsettled Confessional position of the General Synod after the revival of a genuine Lutheran theology both in Europe and in America. They also failed to see clearly that a church which has come to the knowledge of truth in dogmatics cannot remain indifferent to the practice of its pastors and congregations.² "In-

2 The Lutheran revival in Europe restored the liturgies and hymns of the Reformation and post-Reformation to their proper place. The introduction of those old treasures was often attended by violent opposition on the part of the pastors and congregations trained in the school of Rationalism. In the former kingdom of Hanover, for example, this opposition assumed the dimensions of a virtual revolution when, in 1862, the king and the church issued a revised edition of the old pre-rationalistic catechism. The same critical, not to say hostile, attitude toward the Lutheran liturgy is still evident

discriminate" pulpit fellowship and "open communion" are flagrant violations of the Confessions for which the Lutheran Church stands. Dogmatic and practical theology form an inseparable unity.

True, Schmucker and his co-laborers were possessed of genuine evangelical piety. Their tendency to cultivate the fellowship of Christians of other denominations, therefore, was not based on the rational argument of the Universalists and Unitarians; it had its roots rather in a vivid appreciation of the *Una Sancta*. They conceived of faith primarily in the subjective sense as personal trust in the vicarious atonement. The truth of this conception is also emphasized by F. Pieper in his work on dogmatics, *Christliche Dogmatik*,³ when he states repeatedly that such faith is a common possession of all Christians. There is no controversy with the Reformed at this point. The Lutheran Church is not the only saving church. It differs from the Reformed Church in its interpretation of doctrine; in the opinion of the Missouri theologians, the Reformed interpretation departs from the Word of God, and any kind of fellowship whatsoever with false doctrine, they maintain, is forbidden by God and detrimental to the church. Hence there is, in the eyes of Missouri, no way of establishing or even demonstrating unity of faith with a large number of true Christians so long as they remain within the Reformed denominations. While such unity, as they hold, is a spiritual fact, it cannot be made outwardly visible so long as false doctrine prevails in the church. When these theologians speak of false doctrine they, of course, assume that their own interpretation of the Bible is absolutely free from error. We cannot enter here upon a discussion of the philosophic principles that underlie this view; suffice it to say that Walther and his school seem to have remained unaware of the subjective element in the act of cognition. It is significant that Pieper's voluminous work contains not a single paragraph in which

in not a few of our own churches of German origin, for in most cases the charter members of those churches had received their religious training under rationalistic pastors. They were wholly unaware that the church which they aimed to perpetuate in America was not the genuine church of the Reformation, but a Lutheranism adulterated by Rationalism.

3 Three vols., 1917 ff., translated into English by W. Albrecht, 1941.

this and related problems of dogmatic prolegomena are discussed. As to the practical implications of this view, we repeat that upon this basis there is no way of making the *communio sanctorum* a practical reality in the present world.

It is natural that Professor M. Reu, the leading scholar of the American Lutheran Church, should take a mediating position. In a lecture on *Unionism*, delivered before a free conference of pastors of the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, May 8, 1939,⁴ he reiterates the stand of his church body on a strict adherence to the Galesburg Rule. He also voices approval of a resolution in the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod to the effect that "the orthodox character of a church is established not by its mere name nor by its outward acceptance of, and subscription to, an orthodox creed, but by the doctrine which is *actually* taught in its pulpits, in its theological seminaries, and in its publications." This conviction, he says, is the barrier which separates the American Lutheran Church not only from the Lutheran state churches of Europe, in which conflicting schools of theological thought are accorded equal rights, but also from the United Lutheran Church which, in his eyes, is guilty of the same offense. However, it is significant that, in the course of the lecture, he registers his dissent from the practice of Missouri at three particular points: (1) He defends the cooperation of his synod with other Lutherans in the Lutheran World Convention for, as he rightly says, "the Lutheran World Convention is no more than a free conference, which may express itself on points of faith and life, but has no power to pass binding resolutions." (2) Likewise, he declines to see unionism in the cooperation with the National Lutheran Council and the National Lutheran Educational Conference, for both agencies confine their activities to the sphere known as *res externae*. (3) Last but not least, he defends the *occasional* practice of *private* prayer fellowship with Christians outside of his own communion. This point is of great significance. By rejecting the practice of Missouri at this particular point, Professor Reu leaves room for a demonstra-

4 Printed in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, June 1939; translated into English by J. Bodensieck and reprinted in *In the Interest of Lutheran Unity*, 1940, pp. 19-46.

tion of the oneness of the church on this side of eternity. Besides, he gives special emphasis to the fact that "faith" is fundamentally something more than correct exhibition of doctrine. The doctrinal and intellectual element of faith he rightly holds to be subordinate to the "existential" nature of faith and of the church. The question is, shall we let the matter rest here? Is any step beyond private prayer fellowship to be branded as unionism and disloyalty to the Lutheran Confessions?

Let us first confine our argument to the problem of Lutheran unity. The esteemed professor of Dubuque points with satisfaction to the fact that to date his synod has been successful in keeping a celebration of Holy Communion off the program of the Lutheran World Convention. Communion at the table of the Lord, he says, is church fellowship; and church fellowship cannot be established under present conditions either with the United Lutheran Church in America or with the Lutherans of Europe. True, the celebration of Holy Communion is an act of confession (I Cor. 11:28), not of the purity of the church, however, but of the atoning death and the coming of the Lord. In Lutheran theology the emphasis in the Eucharist is not on what men are or do, but on that which the Lord does. To give chief consideration to the worthiness of men, is a sort of Crypto-Calvinism. Besides, what is un-Lutheran or un-Scriptural in the communion service of the United Lutheran Church? The teaching of the Confessions on the Lord's Supper is the teaching of the United Lutheran Church (as it is also the teaching of the Lutheran Church of Bavaria to which Professor Reu owes his religious training in childhood). The order of Holy Communion in the United Lutheran Church is the unadulterated order of ecumenical Lutheranism.⁵ Should any one object that he cannot be certain whether the ministrant of the sacrament in the United Lutheran Church is himself loyal to the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence, it is sufficient to recall that in the Lutheran

5 The adjective "true" before "Body" and "Blood" in the words of distribution, which is retained in the order of the American Lutheran Church and of the Missouri Synod, but which is omitted in the Common Service Book of the United Lutheran Church, is not original. It was added about the year 1600 to counteract crypto-Calvinistic tendencies.

view the worthiness of the ministrant does not affect the nature of the sacrament. Besides, the disciplinary practice of the Synodical Conference and of the American Lutheran Church does not make them immune to tragic inconsistencies within the ranks of their own clergy. The Lutheran character of the sacrament is endangered only when the liturgy of the church or the public utterances of the ministrant are clearly inconsistent with the Lutheran teaching of the Lord's Supper. The same holds true regarding a celebration of Holy Communion within the framework of the Lutheran World Convention. We feel that we could be certain *a priori* that such a celebration would be in harmony with the unadulterated practice of the whole Lutheran Church. Contrary to the opinion of Professor Reu, we believe that the meetings of the Lutheran World Convention have fallen short in this that they did not afford the opportunity for the Lutherans from various tongues and lands to unite at the altar in the holy sacrament.⁶

Next, there is the problem of the relationship of the Lutheran Church toward the Reformed denominations. As we have seen,

6 In his lecture *Can We Still Hold Fast to the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper?* (*Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, May-June 1940, March-April 1941, reprinted as a monograph, 1941) he rejects the modification of the Lutheran doctrine by such men as Seeberg, Stange, Althaus, and J. Jeremias, though he is very glad, he says, "that all these theologians hold to the conviction that the Lord's Supper is a means of grace . . . and that they all reject the Calvinistic idea that it is only the divine nature according to which Christ is present. . . ." Of these theologians, Althaus in particular is very emphatic in rejecting the idea that it is the glorified Body of Christ which is given in the sacrament. This conception, according to Althaus, has no basis in the New Testament; rather, Christ gives us, in and with the earthly elements, a share in His atoning death. It is this view of Althaus that is especially objectionable to many Lutherans who hold that it is indeed the glorified nature of Christ which is offered in the Supper. Is it really necessary to remind these good Lutherans of the fact that their emphasis on the glorified nature of our Lord in the Supper is a deviation from the original Lutheran teaching? Pieper, in his work referred to, takes sharp issue with the view that Christ in the Supper imparts to us His glorified Body. The Real Presence, Pieper says, is not conditioned by the exaltation of Christ, but by the *communicatio idiomatum*. Though the Lord is now exalted, in the Supper we do not receive His body as being glorified, but as given in death for the remission of sins (III, 419 ff.). The difficulty with Althaus lies in his tendency to obscure the real unity of Jesus, the Lamb of God, with the Jesus exalted on high. The same objection must be raised when Althaus says that the Real Presence is warranted by the action of the church, not by the elements of bread and wine. As a matter of fact, both the church and the elements are necessary to constitute the Supper. Yet Althaus is not a crypto-Calvinist with whom we ought to renounce altar fellowship.

Professor Reu, in opposition to Missouri, defends the practice of occasional private prayer fellowship with Christians of denominations other than Lutheran, but correctly insists that we ought to observe a careful distinction between the spiritual unity of the true believers and the organic unity of churches.⁷ Yet we may ask again, is that all that we owe to our Christian brethren in other churches? Is it not perhaps significant that the nature of Baptism has not received much, if indeed any, consideration when the problem of church unity has been discussed among us? As we know, it is a principle accepted by all *churches* that Baptism is valid whenever administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, irrespective of the denominational affiliation of the ministrant of Baptism. To deny this principle has been looked upon as a *sectarian* tendency ever since the fourth century. If, then, by Baptism all Christians are united in one body, shall other doctrinal differences be allowed to treat that unity as non-existent?

The problem of inter-church cooperation is complicated in our country by the fact that in America the different denominations do not exist as geographical units. In contrast to conditions as they exist (or existed till recently) in Europe, our members freely mingle with Christians of other denominations and with people who have never identified themselves with any church. Yet we have responsibilities in connection with the social and moral welfare of the civic community of which we are a part. It is precisely at this point that the ordinary pastor is chiefly confronted with the problem of wider cooperation. The saddest thing, of course, is the fact that there is in many places and at many times no cooperation even among the various Lutheran synods. We challenge those who are indifferent to this crime to read the striking article by a Missouri pastor, H. F. Wind, of Buffalo, published in *The American Lutheran* and reprinted in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (July 1941), "Lutheran Union and Human Welfare." In a country established on the principle of separation of church and state, and with the Lutheran Church in the minority, we cannot expect

7 See his recent article "Muessen die Verhandlungen mit Missouri nun aufhoeren?" in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, October 1941.

the public to show any preference for Lutheran service. The question is whether we shall avail ourselves of opportunities such as social welfare, commencement exercises, etc., or whether we shall silence ourselves into oblivion? The same is true in regard to the international Christian movements identified with Stockholm, Lausanne, Oxford, and Edinburgh. As long as we are offered the opportunity to testify to the truth of the Scriptures and to register our protest against un-Scriptural ideas in the official reports of such meetings, we not only miss a great opportunity for Christian service, but commit a positive sin when we refuse to turn our endeavors to the gigantic tasks of Christendom. Let us take Luther as our example. When the Lutherans at his time were asked to appear at a universal council, the theologians did not turn down the invitation; but Luther himself prepared what have become known as the Smalcald Articles to be presented at the Council of Mantua.

To sum up our argument: (1) The oneness of the church is not only an invisible and spiritual fact; it is also a visible and tangible fact by virtue of Baptism. (2) Likewise, unity of faith is a fact, not only a goal. It rests upon the creative work of the Spirit and does not depend on synodical action, for by "faith" the New Testament means primarily, yea almost exclusively, a subjective, personal trust in God (*fides qua creditur*.)⁸ It is the primary duty of the church to lead all nations to the obedience of faith (Rom. 1:5; 16:26). A synod, therefore, which says that "doctrine is the most important matter in the church," and that "indoctrination is her chief concern,"⁹ fails in the realization of the whole will of God. (4) Nevertheless, doctrinal differences are a matter of grave concern. They are evidence of the erring and sinful nature of the human mind. (5) As Lutherans we must be consistent in rejecting all movements which aim at an organic or federated union church, on the one hand, while, on the other, we

8 Cf. the famous statement of the great Erlangen theologian K. von Hofmann: "For it is just as true that each one has his own theology, if he has indeed a theology at all, as it is not true that each one has his own faith, provided he has faith at all." *Der Schriftbeweis*, 2nd ed. 1857, I, 4.

9 *Popular Symbolics* by Th. Engelder, W. Arndt, Th. Graebner, and F. E. Mayer (St. Louis: 1934), pp. 7, 13.

must learn to take seriously Article Seven of the Augsburg Confession: "And to the true unity of the church, it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments." (6) Indiscriminate altar and pulpit fellowship is un-Lutheran because it is based on doctrinal indifference and is detrimental to the church. (7) The practice of union services, where it still exists, should be discontinued. Those of us who still defend the practice of Schmucker and his age are a stumbling-block to Lutheran unity. If a community inaugurates a program of joint services, it would be desirable to let the churches alternate and to make one single synodical group or congregation responsible for the whole religious program at one particular service. Baccalaureate services and the like are not, strictly speaking, union services.¹⁰ (8) Cooperation in the sphere of *res externae* is not only desirable; it is mandatory. (9) Altar fellowship with all Lutherans at all altars where the sacrament is celebrated according to the Lutheran order is the only logical and spiritual attitude. (10) While the sacrament requires only the objective order of service to guarantee its genuine character, the personal qualifications of a man are decisive in the work of preaching. Pulpit fellowship, therefore, should be based on agreement with the religious and theological convictions of the individual preacher. (11) As Lutherans we should realize that we are debtors of all mankind, in our preaching of the Gospel and especially in works of charity, in relation to the whole of Christendom. Lutherans, therefore, should be in evidence at international and interdenominational conferences. At such occasions our representatives, however, should keep in mind that they are under obligation neither to compromise nor to tone down the message entrusted to them, but to act as witnesses of the whole truth of the Scripture.

10 A union service, in our opinion, is a service sponsored by congregations of different denominational affiliations, whereas at a baccalaureate service, for example, a non-religious entity asks the minister to consecrate its work in the name of God. For a parallel to this custom in American life we may point to the fact that in the days of Jesus sacrifices were offered at the temple both for and in the name of individual Gentiles as well as for the Roman government.

II

In the second part of our paper we shall limit ourselves to a brief discussion of the controversies over predestination and eschatology (Anti-Christ and Millenium), and shall close with a few remarks on the authority of the Scriptures.

For information on the origin and development of the predestinarian controversy, the reader is referred to the instructive chapter in Neve-Allbeck (pp. 207-221). For our purpose it will suffice to understand clearly the intentions by which each of the contestants was moved. The situation may be summarized as follows: To Missouri the doctrine of predestination was a theological problem, to its opponents a psychological. Missouri was interested in safeguarding the monergism of grace. Ohio-Iowa was determined not to allow this doctrine to destroy the harmony of the *ordo salutis* and sought to save the believer from despair. The Missourians were not fatalists, nor were their opponents synergists, as was often said when resentment ran high. According to Missouri, election is not *intuitu fidei* (that would be synergism); it is rather *ad fidem*.¹¹ Faith is not a condition of election, but its result. Election, however, is not, as the Calvinists teach, *absoluta*, but *ordinata*, i. e. it is conditioned by the meritorious work of Christ. Neither is election *geminata* (double); God wills the salvation of all. Election pertains to the saved only, whereas condemnation is the fatal punishment of man's own stubborn resistance. The question, *Cur alii prae aliis*, as Augustine put it, must remain an unfathomable mystery. This position of Missouri is vindicated by A. Koeberle when he says in his *Quest for Holiness* (1936, p. 143): "Man cannot save himself, but he can destroy himself. My faith is produced *sola gratia*, the *repugnare* is *mea maxima culpa*. The *bona opera* are God's work, the *mala opera* are our work. The 'I will' comes from God, the 'I will not' from man's own choice, etc."

11 While it is true that the term *intuitu fidei* is not found in the Scriptures, we believe that it can be used in a sense harmonious with the Scriptures, i. e., when it is used to designate nothing but the fact that God has predestinated those who in time, *sola gratia*, believe in Him.

The paradoxical nature of the teaching of Missouri is obvious. This circumstance, however, should not be held against it, as has been done at times. To Missouri goes the credit of having held firmly to this Biblical view against all comers. The weakness of Missouri's position is that it is not paradoxical enough; her theologians are apt to minimize the force of those passages in the Bible in which man is commanded to repent, believe, fight the good fight, etc.¹² Because these statements are found in the Scriptures, they are tolerated by the Missourians, but they receive no emphasis in the whole of the *ordo salutis*. It seems to me that the danger of quietism lurks in the backyards of not a few Missouri Lutheran churches. But the church must guard as carefully against spiritual and ethical indolence as against all sorts of synergism. A predestinarian monergism can be as harmful as a synergistic and moralizing interpretation of the Christian religion. No one has ever expressed the dialectical and paradoxical nature of the Christian life better than St. Paul when he wrote: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do according to his good pleasure (Phil. 2:12 f.). Loyalty to the Word of God demands that we speak about grace and human responsibilities, faith and works in such antithetical terms, and preach the Gospel in both the indicative and the imperative mood. In the entire work of salvation man must be denied all credit; but he dare never be relieved of his full responsibility. The Word of God is not rightly divided if the imperatives of the New Testament lose their positive implications. The unregenerated and the generated alike are commanded not to sin; both are called to repentance and faith and to a life that is pleasing in the sight of God. Besides, as long as we continue merely to rationalize about predestination, with the thought in the back of our minds that we belong to the elect while the lost ones are the others, we are not fit to speak of predestination at all. The monergism of grace must not become a catch phrase of a theological school without becoming a part of its prayers and spiritual life. The statements

12 See Pieper, Vol. II, 564 ff.

of St. Paul concerning election do not represent an intellectual insight of the Apostle, a doctrine which he held; they are rather "existential" judgments about the love of God manifest in Christ Jesus. Pastors who have never been stirred to the depth of their being by the New Testament teaching of predestination, but subscribe nevertheless to either the *Brief Statement* or the *Chicago Theses* as the *conditio sine qua non* of church fellowship, confuse their flocks and sin against the unity of the Lutheran Church. Besides, a work like Koeberle's *Quest for Holiness* is evidence that the truth cannot remain hidden in a church that honestly tries to be true to the Bible and the Confessions. After almost a century of synergistic aberrations among the leading theologians of the day, the voice of the Reformation is sounded anew in Koeberle's stimulating book. This fact proves that we in America could have reached the same genuinely Biblical solution in a more quiet and peaceful manner. The fury and resentment displayed in the controversy over predestination was not of God. On the contrary, it has at many times poisoned our relations with suspicion and animosity. It was far above the ordinary pastor and congregation to pass an intelligent judgment on the exceedingly subtle definitions that were drawn up in this controversy.

In the eschatological controversy Missouri followed Luther in his continuous-historical interpretation of Revelation. In the Smalcald Articles Luther designated the Pope as the "very Anti-Christ." Missouri holds that this statement, contained in a writing which belongs to the Book of Concord, is binding upon all Lutherans. Likewise, Missouri rejects each and every semblance of Millennialism and holds with Luther that the thousand years of Revelation 20 are to be sought in the past history of the church.

Over against this conception, the Iowa theologians, under the impact of the Erlangen School, leaned toward the futurist or eschatological interpretation of Revelation. While they were agreed with Missouri as to the anti-Christian character of the Papacy, and while they were willing to admit that of all historical powers hostile to Christ the Pope resembles most closely the description of the Anti-Christ in II Thessalonians 2, they nevertheless wanted to leave room for the view that at the end of time

another man might be revealed as the last Anti-Christ. They likewise held that a modified teaching of pre-millennialism was not contrary to Article XVII of the Augsburg Confession.

As to the religious intentions of the Missourians we can only register our approval. The warning of our Lord, "Watch and pray, for you know not when the time is," would be illusory if the signs that are to precede His coming were not already fulfilled. For that reason Luther, who confidently expected the end of time before the close of the sixteenth century, was right when he inferred from the nature of the Papacy that it was the very Anti-Christ. But Luther's statement is a historical, not a dogmatic statement; he likewise defined the Turk as the Anti-Christ¹³ because it was the Papacy and the Turkish empire which continually threatened the very existence of the Evangelical Church. To demand subscription to this historical judgment of Luther as the *conditio sine qua non* for church fellowship in the twentieth century, means utterly to distort the religious motives underlying Luther's words.¹⁴ As to the identification of the Papacy with the Anti-Christ, we prefer to hold, as Paul Althaus does, that we have a right to repeat the judgment of Luther that the Pope is the Anti-Christ only if we are persuaded that the present conflict between God and the world, Christ and Satan is fought to its finish at the Roman-Protestant battle line, if we are convinced that the church of Rome is the great power tempting us to betray the Gospel. Luther's insight into the nature of the Anti-Christ should not be dogmatized by us as the seventeenth century dogmatized it—it must be "actualized" in order to be authentic for us.¹⁵ The question then is, can any one be sincere in holding this view when he remembers the annihilation of the church, Catholic and Protestant, in Russia, and the spirit of martyrdom as shown by

13 Erlangen edition 60, 176 ff.

14 In this connection it is interesting to compare the wording of Luther's famous hymn, "Lord, keep us steadfast in Thy Word," as found in modern Lutheran hymnals. While the editors of the Common Service Book have followed the paraphrase now customary in many German hymn books, "*Und steure deiner Feinde Mord*," the German *Kirchenbuch* of the former General Council as well as the various hymnals of the Missouri Synod still read: "Restrain the murderous Pope and Turk."

15 *Die letzten Dinge*, 4th edition, 1933, p. 275.

members of both churches in their conflict with the Hitler regime in Germany? The definition of the Anti-Christ as held by Missouri is, in our opinion, too intellectual: the Pope is the Anti-Christ because he denies the doctrine of justification by faith *sine operibus*. This definition overlooks the fact that the Christian life is richer than doctrinal statements seem to indicate. Besides, it overlooks that in Roman Catholic teaching the *gratia infusa* is intrinsically connected with the meritorious work of Christ. In addition, we should remember that Luther himself was not so one-sided as to condemn everything Roman Catholic. He did not completely destroy the Roman Mass, but purified it, and he always admitted that the true church existed also under the Papacy during the Middle Ages. Furthermore, our understanding of Revelation has been considerably enriched by the work of the historico-religious school. One thing now evident to us is that every interpretation of the apocalyptic writings of the Scriptures must proceed from a contemporary historical basis. Consequently revelation is not an outline of future history, but an instrument which exhibits a kaleidoscopic view of the conflict of the primitive church with the Jewish and Roman authorities. As Revelation 19 contains a prophecy concerning the downfall of the Roman Empire, so the millennium described in chapter 20 signifies the triumphant spread of the Gospel during the remaining history of the church. But the history of the primitive church is typological. Its conflict with the anti-Christian powers exemplified by Jerusalem (religion) and Rome (state) and its subsequent victory over all her enemies will be repeated time and again "till moons shall wax and wane no more." Each generation, therefore, is right when it tries to interpret its own history in the light of Revelation and to derive, from such meditation on the Word, inspiration, consolation, and patience in "the race that is set before us." The Anti-Christ, then, as we see, was for the age of John Caligula, Nero and Domitian; for Luther it was the Pope and the Turk; for the church of Russia it was Lenin; for the church of Germany the Hitler regime has undoubtedly assumed an anti-Christian character; for the church in America it may be religion in general, "democracy," and the Social Gospel. Whenever these things come

to pass, then it is the "last hour" (I John 2:18), for eternity is not a distant hope, it is an ever present reality. "All times are last times, and every wave of time beats against the shore of eternity." Only in this way will each generation profit from a study of prophecy and be kept from falling prey to a merely intellectual apprehension of truth.

And, finally, a passing word on the meaning and authority of the Scriptures will be expected. We have no intention to enter upon a lengthy discussion of the subject. This would require a volume. Here we should like to make a few "marginal notes." Undoubtedly all Lutheran bodies are agreed in this, that the Bible is the only and absolute source of religious authority. In this respect there is no divergency of opinion. Conflicting ideas, however, enter in when the question is raised as to the form in which the Scriptures were given and the mode of their inspiration. The one party holds that the authority of the Bible is solely a religious authority and that in all matters pertaining to language, culture, and civilization the sacred writers have written under the limitations of the age in which they lived. The other party holds such reservations to be incompatible with the divine character of the sacred writings and detrimental to the absolute authority of Holy Writ. To this charge we may reply that the frantic endeavors to maintain the authority of the Scriptures in the realm of secular science are akin to what Luther calls, in his Heidelberg Theses of 1518, *theologia gloriae*. These theologians take offense at the *Knechtsgestalt* of the Bible. It is incomprehensible to them that God should have so loved the world that He stooped down to meet man on his own level. The mind of these theologians is moving in the direction of Scholasticism because they try to establish a rational proof for faith. The absolute inerrancy of sixty-six different writings, composed during a period of fifteen hundred years, is supposed to be a cogent proof for the divine origin and character of these books and is held to warrant their dependability. Professor Reu really contradicted himself in his lecture on *What is Scripture and How Can We Become Certain of Its Divine Origin?*¹⁶ After a lengthy discussion of the iner-

16 *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, July-August 1939, reprinted in the pamphlet referred to, pp. 47-83.

rancy of Scripture in the rational sense of the word, he says, "And finally we should not forget that the statement 'Scripture is the inerrant word of God' is a statement of faith" (p. 72), for that which is proved by reason needs not be apprehended by faith and that which is a matter of faith cannot be demonstrated by reason. Regardless of faith, the maxim stands that two and two equals four. Conversely, faith believes in the mystery of the Trinity regardless of any rational objection. When, therefore, the Bible speaks of hades as being located below the earth, and heaven as being above, or of the "four corners of the earth," we now know that these expressions of the Bible are conditioned by the pre-scientific view of the universe. To excommunicate each other over such conflicting views is one of the gravest sins that may be committed in these trying days when the very essence of faith is at stake. The customary appeal to the inerrant autographs of the Scriptures offers no way out of the dilemma.¹⁷ It is a toying with a hypothesis of which we know next to nothing. Besides it is dangerous, for, if applied with full force, it will undermine all confidence in the present text.

The theory of inspiration as held by the one group of Lutheran scholars is too mechanical. For if it were true, as Pieper says, that God never accommodated Himself to a false notion in the realm of science, we assume either that Israel was far advanced beyond its neighboring tribes in all matters of geology, geography, history, and astronomy, or we have to conjecture a break in the self-consciousness of the sacred writers: while ordinarily subject to the false notions of their times, they were, under the influence of the inspiring activity of the Spirit, removed from all contemporary limitations. While the first alternative is contrary to facts, as we know them, the second one conceives of inspiration not as a personal but as a mechanical process after the fashion of pagan divination. Besides, how void of meaning science is for religion can be seen from the fact that as long as the geocentric view of the universe prevailed in Western civilization, man, in his thought and action, was oriented to God. But when man dis-

17 The distinction between "errant copies" and "inerrant autographs" was first set up by the Roman Catholic writer, Richard Simon, in the seventeenth century.

covered the laws of the solar system, he lost sight of God. When the earth became small, man became big. A correct view of nature is neither a prerequisite of faith nor its consequence.

We are told that, according to good Lutheran theology, the Bible not only contains the Word of God, but that it is the Word of God. While there is much truth in this statement, nevertheless it reflects the inability on the part of some scholars to distinguish properly between the original message of God and its codification in written form. The written Word not only contains words of God but also words of the devil and of many evil characters. The only way in which these sayings can be claimed to be part of the Word of God is that they are a part of the *res* and *verba* suggested by the Holy Spirit to the sacred writers. But the fact that the Bible contains such sayings clearly shows that we deal in the Bible not only with the revelation of God but also with the reception of that revelation on the part of man. Not every religious or ethical statement in the Old Testament, therefore, is final. Christ is final. He is the sum and substance of the Scriptures and all interpretation of Scripture must flow from what we Lutherans call the "material principle" of the Reformation: justification by faith, *propter Christum, sola gratia, sine operibus*.

Many other problems might be mentioned which seem to have a bearing on the nature of the Bible. There is, for example, the use of the Septuagint in the New Testament; for the Septuagint, in many instances, is not a translation but an alteration of the Hebrew text.¹⁸ There is also the problem of the canonicity of the individual writings of the Scriptures. The extent of the Old Testament was still a matter of controversy during the first century of our era, and there is no reference in the New Testament by which that problem was settled as by divine interference. In accepting the Hebrew canon, the church has accepted as final the decision of the rabbis who were unequivocal in their opposition

18 Pieper's remark that the Holy Spirit, as author of the Old Testament, has reserved for Himself the right to change His own words when quoting from the Old Testament in the New Testament in order to interpret the text of the Old, entirely misses the difficulties involved. See Vol. I, 300 ff.

to Christ. In a similar way, the extent of the New Testament was determined not by revelation but by a decision of the church. This fact, we feel, is a hard nut to crack for those theologians who want to establish an absolute cleavage between the activity of the Holy Spirit in the writers of the Bible and His presence in guiding the church. Moreover, this fact seems to offer an *Ansatz* for an ecclesiastical conception of Christianity as held in some quarters of the old Iowa Synod as compared with the strictly Biblical view as expoused by the Missouri Synod.

We must come to a close. From the past, we feel, Lutherans in America should have learned the lesson that unity will not be achieved by drawing up new resolutions and adopting statements, declarations, and agreements. The unity of our church lies in her historic Confessions. And of these we must continue to attach primary importance to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. Though we may hold the Formula of Concord in high esteem and may be firmly convinced that its theology is in perfect harmony with the older Confessions, we cannot deny the historical fact that it has never been accepted by all the Lutheran churches. The Lutherans in America have received no call to draw up new confessions by which a cleavage is established between the ecumenical Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America.

The approach to unity requires willingness and courage to face the call to repentance. When we meet in committees or at conferences we do not sit as judges to mete out punishment one to another. Though it should happen that one group should have no need to make a basic change in its teachings, the spirit in which the controversies have been conducted in the past was at many times alien to the spirit of our Lord. To read some of the polemical literature now, makes one blush over the rudeness displayed at that time.

The call to unity involves more than reaching agreement on doctrinal issues. It is a call to cleanse our hearts and sanctify our lives. "To this may our blessed Father in heaven help us."

THE PLANTING OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN INDIA

J. ROY STROCK
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

TO MEASURE the successful growth and the probability of permanency of a church, we cannot but investigate what it is doing in aggressive evangelism, how it is arranging for its support, and what progress it is making in the direction of the perfecting of a form of government that will stand the test of time. An unsympathetic critic of the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church in India could doubtless argue that although the church has been established, its record of achievement in various directions is so low as to throw considerable doubt upon its ability to survive. One can, however, see enough evidence of vital Christian life, experience, and activity in many individuals and congregations to make a person of even a moderate degree of faith, thank God and take courage. Progress has not been the same throughout, but there has been progress, and progress is being made today. We can face the future with confidence, knowing that we have put our faith in the ever-living Head of the Church, who loved it and gave Himself for it.

NUMERICAL GROWTH

I think that a few statistics will suffice to give an idea of the growth of our church. In both the Guntur and Rajahmundry missions, the early years showed rather slow progress, but since 1880 the increases in church membership have been most encouraging. For the united Guntur-Rajahmundry mission, the first decade after the merger showed an increase of 64% with an average per year of 4.9%. For the decade 1919-1929 the increase was 67.6%, while for the last decade, i. e. 1929-39, the increase fell to 26.8%.

The abnormally low increase for 1939 has been viewed with

alarm by us all and has led to much searching of heart and scrutinizing of methods and policies by both missionaries and Indians. Undoubtedly one reason for the fall in accessions is our altogether too heavy dependence upon school teachers for congregational and evangelistic work. In other words, during recent years we have taken the line of least resistance and have tried to balance budgets by dismissing and retiring catechists and evangelists, while putting greater burdens for gospel work upon the school teachers. This seemed, indeed, the only way to save money because all the workers of every grade and class, school teachers included, were already bearing, in salary cuts, all that they could possibly bear. Since a school teacher's cut salary came almost or entirely from the government in the shape of grants-in-aid to the schools, the closing of even rather poor schools and the dismissal of teachers meant very little gain to the budget, if any at all. At the same time the government became much more strict in its requirements and increased the inspecting staff in order to see to the fulfillment by the schools of these requirements. This tightening up of control and raising of standards meant new burdens for the teacher. But at the same time the church also was increasing his burdens by putting upon him much of the work and responsibility formerly carried by catechists and evangelists. It is no wonder that after two or three years of this kind of policy the accessions showed a sharp decline. We believe and hope that the changes in staff introduced from July, 1940, which changes include the appointment of more catechists and evangelists, will result in a decided quickening and intensification of both the pastoral care of the congregations and the evangelization of those who are outside the church. This strengthening of the purely spiritual work will, we trust, gradually produce an increase in the rate of growth.

SELF-PROPAGATION

This brief glance at statistics brings us to the all-important questions of progress in evangelization or self-propagation.

Throughout the entire history of our mission the village school has been almost universally used as the spearhead in our

attack. As Dr. Wolf put it in *After Fifty Years*, "Our Mission, like many others in India, began in school. The school frequently preceded the church and out of it the church gradually grew." Today we can most truthfully say that the closing of numerous schools because of the government's higher requirements in various directions, and also our inability to establish new schools on account of lack of funds to maintain them during the period prior to their recognition by government and their admission to aid, are two factors which have contributed to the fall in the number of accessions. On the other hand, since it must be admitted that this method of evangelization is largely dependent upon funds from outside the church, i. e. from either the government or the mission, the question must be faced as to whether this way of bringing persons and communities into the church is of permanent value. It has been most valuable in the past, and certainly serves admirably today in many places as a means for interesting the people in Christ. Since, however, government may take over all elementary education, and since non-Christian communities will not support Christian schools financially, it is obvious that this sort of approach has serious weaknesses, especially as we think of the church itself as fully responsible for its own propagation. Moreover, in many places, new schools cannot be established because a Hindu or a quasi-government school is in existence, and the Department of Public Instruction does not permit unwholesome competition or duplication of effort.

We are thus brought face to face with the vital question of the capacity of the church for direct self-propagation. Can we say that our congregations are able, by personal work, Bible teaching, evangelistic meetings, and other methods to bring the Gospel in an effective way to the non-Christians of their villages? If, generally speaking, we must give a negative answer to this question, where lies the trouble, and can the defect be remedied? When we compare our church, and the methods by which notable successes in the ingathering of souls have been achieved, with the methods and success of the Korean Church, we cannot but admit that the methods employed by our mission have failed to put upon the young church a sufficiently heavy responsibility regarding its

own growth. The Korean Church, with its marvelous system of Bible study for all, and its tradition of personal work to be carried on by all, stands in striking contrast to the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church in India. I do not see that we can blame our church or our Christians, but I feel most strongly that one of the most pressing problems we have to face in our church and mission is this problem of training, inspiring, and leading voluntary lay workers. We have talked about the need and in some Taluks something has been accomplished by means of summer schools, elders' meetings, classes for young men, etc., but the problem has not been tackled, in my opinion, either energetically or universally, and until it is solved, self-propagation will be an idea only. The encouraging fact is that in very many of our congregations a fairly large number of men and women are able to read, and these are the people who could be trained. With a nucleus of trained laymen, others who are illiterate but earnest could be associated. Until our present system can be effectively supplemented by voluntary, unpaid workers, any expectation of large increases in church membership is, I believe, wishful thinking.

The classes of workers known as evangelists and catechists are essential and their salaries are usually so low as not to prove much of a burden to the budget. There is, however, a fact that dare not be overlooked, and that is that however many efficient workers we may employ, they will be able to accomplish little if the inner life of the church is such as to nullify the effect of the workers' witness. In writing about the church in Borneo a writer in the Madras report says, "Experience has proved again and again that the church herself in any given district is by far the most potent evangelistic factor. Where the church herself is zealous and strong, there, as it were, Christ in His Body is strong, too, to challenge, convert, and influence." Fortunately, we can say that some of our congregations are sufficiently alive, normally and spiritually, to reinforce the witness. Bishop Pickett has in both of his books on the mass movements very definitely stated that in a number of places the Sudra converts were drawn to Christ by the evident change that they had noticed in their outcast servants and neighbors, a change which they felt could not be accounted

for except by Christianity. It is a fact that in some villages there is nothing distinctive about the lives of our church members, but in others there is evidence of new life and victorious power in Jesus Christ. Here we see the radiating of a positive witness for Christ. We can thank God that some Christians, even in a decidedly non-Christian environment, are exerting the quiet influence of saintly character and of a Christian home. Much more of this kind of influence will be evident if more intensive shepherding becomes possible. While we know of congregations which are torn by strife and factions, some of us know congregations that are in the best tradition of Christian life and activity. Surely it will be for the best interests of the church of the future for us now to use every possible means for the strengthening of the present church in its worship and its service to the community, as well as in the moral and spiritual growth of its individual members, for it is in a zealous, strong, and truly Christian congregation that we see the most promising evangelistic influences. Although the congregations of the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church have not reached the height of achievement that they ought to have reached during a comparatively long period of growth, we may rejoice because of the potentialities in them and because of the strong leadership, both clerical and lay, that is available to lead them forward and upward. Church discipline will certainly be better looked after wherever pastoral care is a reality. In too many parishes the "keys" have become rusty, and a weakening of discipline necessarily means the absence of power in witnessing.

This brings me to our ministry. We were extremely slow—at least in the old Guntur Mission—to ordain pastors. Dr. Wolf in his jubilee history, published in 1892, explains this caution. Even after 1892, probably, men might have been ordained more rapidly. But we need not go back thirty or forty years. Even today pastors are being trained at a rate which seems certain to prove too slow to meet adequately the urgent need for the proper shepherding of our large and growing Christian community. For my part, I believe there are men who might right now be sent for pastoral training, men who have been tried and tested, who have

proved themselves approved workmen, and who have shown in their dealings with schools and congregations that they possess those qualities of stability, tact, faithfulness, zeal, earnestness, interest in persons, and powers of leadership that are so essential for Indian pastors.

If there are men, do we hesitate because of the greater financial burden that an increase in the number of pastors would thrust upon the church? According to the rules now in force, the funds available would be inadequate for a marked increase in the pastorate, but I maintain that these rules might be changed and that a greater number of pastors need not entail a heavier financial burden.

I feel strongly that at present the pastors are usually not *real* pastors. They are superintending pastors or head supervisors or Indian missionaries, the essential pastoral work or shepherding being in the hands of catechists or school teachers. With the larger force of district missionaries now available, I think that the pastorates should be drastically reduced in size, that the missionary parishes should be correspondingly increased in size, and that all catechists and evangelists should be directly under the missionaries, working in the missionary parishes. I argue thus not with a view to the enhancement of the prestige of the missionaries but only and entirely with a view to the securing for the pastors the chance to be real pastors. Can we honestly say that the pastor of a parish of fifteen villages, having perhaps ten congregations, is essentially different from a missionary? And if the pastor is also manager and correspondent of the schools of his parish, he *is* a missionary, but without the clerical assistance and the conveyance amenities a missionary can command. Will any pastor save a very exceptional one under these circumstances be able to know his flock and to call out, train, inspire, and lead the voluntary unpaid workers without whose assistance the self-propagation of the church is and must be an impossible task?

If suitable men are available for the pastorate and the reason for not training more is the lack of sufficient funds to have two or three classes studying concurrently in our Theological Seminary, then I think the time has come for us to retrench some-

where and immediately release funds for this purpose, which is fundamentally important. My strong conviction is that the members of our congregations are not being properly or efficiently shepherded and the result is what must be expected in a Christian community which lacks a Christian tradition and heritage and which is surrounded by, and sometimes permeated with, ideologies, practices, superstitions, fears, and sins that cannot but retard or completely prevent the cultivation of Christian life and character. I do not blame the pastors, most of whom are earnestly endeavoring to be true to their high calling, but some, I fear, do not realize the supreme importance of pastoral care and therefore leave this phase of the work in large measure to their subordinates.

I am convinced that unless the inner life of the congregations, with the Christian home as its chief field and its most significant product, is effectively cared for, the church will prove incapable of maintaining an intensive evangelistic effort. To this end the parishes must be smaller and the pastors must have time for real shepherding, and for leading and training both adults and young people in active evangelism.

I am fully aware of the fact that two of our Indian leaders, Mr. P. C. Moses and the Rev. S. Jeevaratnam, have both argued that the parishes should be increased in size rather than that the number of pastors should be increased. Mr. Moses says that "A pastor can easily look after from twenty to twenty-five congregations situated within a radius of fifteen miles." It all depends, of course, upon the connotation of the words "look after." From what I have seen of the work of Indian pastors and the various calls upon their time and strength, I must say that I believe the "looking after" would fall very far short of pastoral shepherding.

I realize the difficulty, and Mr. Moses' solution is one way to solve the problem. My objections are two: (1) The result of our present system is that true shepherding by the *pastor* is ordinarily impossible. The congregation of the village in which he lives may fare well, but the rest cannot but be more or less neglected. (2) This solution puts self-support in too prominent a place. Mr. Moses quotes the following from Madras, and it is the essence of Bishop Azariah's book, *Christian Giving*: "The

support of the church must be rooted in its spiritual life." There we have the dilemma or the vicious circle. Self-support is rooted in spiritual life, but in order to secure self-support we give the pastor so many congregations to look after that there is no spiritual life in which self-support can be rooted.

My argument is that if a congregation must be for a time to a certain degree neglected, it ought to be under the missionary and his lay helpers. The pastors should be given parishes of such a size that they can really do pastoral work, cultivate a vital Christian life and experience in all the members, and discover, train, guide, inspire, lead, and supervise the lay volunteers who can assist them in the evangelization of the non-Christians within the area of their respective parishes. Furthermore, if the pastors are able to devote more time to intensive work in parishes of more limited extent, much less touring and supervision by the missionary in these parishes will be necessary, and thus the missionary will find it possible to do more touring in his missionary parish or parishes.

Limitations of space forbid my discussing many interesting and significant contributions by Indians to evangelism, such as the use of Christian literature, the campaign for adult literacy, evangelistic efforts in our higher educational and in our medical institutions, the influence of the Christian home, the work of Bible women, wives of Gospel workers and school teachers, and members of the women's societies, and the activities of the Sunday schools and Luther Leagues.

My conclusion is that our A.E.L. Church has all the machinery it needs for successful self-propagation. Theoretically, she realizes the central place evangelism should have in the church and also that evangelism should be carried on through the church—not through the mission. But that all of us workers are sufficiently zealous cannot be said; our first and central purpose is frequently obscured. With greater consecration, with a more intensive inculcation of the principles of evangelism in all our members, with the maximum utilization of all our forces, paid and voluntary, and with more earnest and faithful prayer to the Lord of the harvest for a mighty outpouring of the Holy Spirit, self-

propagation for the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church would, by the grace and help of God, be assured.

SELF-SUPPORT

We have now come to the weakest element in our triad of self-propagation, self-support, and self-government. Mr. P. C. Moses has called attention to the very serious retrogression in the benevolence of our church during the past decade. From Rs 81,736 in 1928 we fell to Rs 68,309 in 1939. Since the membership increased from 140,462 in 1928 to 185,373 in 1939, the per capita offering for the entire baptized membership dropped from 9.3 *annas* per member in 1928 to 5.9 *annas* in 1939, a decrease of 36½%.

An average of 5.9 *annas* per annum per baptized member represents from one and a half to three days' wages for an unskilled laborer. In the Korean Church, in 1937, the contributions represented something over nine days' wages of a grown man for every man, woman, and child in the enrollment of the churches. In the Khasi Hills, Assam, there is a Christian community of 49,924 and the offerings for the year amounted to Rs 47,160-9-9, an average of slightly more than 15 *annas* per baptized member. For our Andhra Church 1940-41 budget, the highest average apportioned to any Taluk charge is eight *annas* per baptized member and the lowest is five *annas*. For an increase of membership of 31.9 per cent in our church to be accompanied by a decrease in per capita benevolence of 36.6 per cent, means a most serious defect somewhere. Mr. Moses dismissed the world wide depression as a sufficient cause of this lamentable decline. He presented two causes: (1) Too much reliance upon compulsion in the securing of benevolence, the reason for the necessity of compulsion being, of course, the absence of a vital spiritual life; and (2) the waning of evangelistic zeal among the workers and the members of the congregations.

Whether, however, the extremely unfavorable showing in benevolence is due to economic causes or to the low spiritual vitality of the church, I believe it is a fact that we have not yet adequately realized, either as Christian workers or as church

members, that the problem is a spiritual problem. As convincingly shown by Bishop Azariah, the New Testament writers most certainly appealed for gifts and charity on spiritual grounds. The problem is, therefore, most definitely a problem which concerns supremely the inner life of the church, just as self-propagation depends upon the vitality of that life. Whatever we can do towards the quickening of the spiritual life of the rank and file of the members of the church will most undoubtedly result in progress in this matter of self-support. The Jerusalem Conference put it thus: "Self-support will come naturally with the rising tide of spiritual life."

With reference to the foreign subsidy from America, it may be noted that at least once in the past the mission definitely considered the possibility of decreasing by degrees the contribution to the church from the home board. This was never done, one reason being the unexpected fall in foreign receipts due to the depression. The plan is even now a possible course, but I myself feel that what ought to be decreased gradually is the subsidy for established work only, that is, congregational work. The subsidy for purely evangelistic work should not, in my opinion, be decreased for many years to come.

We must also face the unpleasant fact that the vast majority of our church members are extremely poor and that, therefore, the problem of local self-support is everywhere to a very great degree an economic problem. Some have said that "the road to self-support is industrial education." Our mission, as well as many others, has done something along the lines of industrial education, but the problem of self-support seems to be as much of a problem as ever. The very size of the volume of the Madras Report on "The Economic Bases of the Church" shows how important it is that missions and churches should study the economic background and environment of the people they serve and how necessary it is for church leaders to know both the earning capacity of the church members and their practices in respect of giving. Certainly we must also do what we can to increase the earning capacity. Nevertheless, we are always driven back to the spiritual side of the problem, for, as Merle Davis points out, "When

the rural Christian transfers his loyalties and giving from the old brotherhood to the new, the problem of church support will be well on the way to a solution." In other words, Christ the Lord has not been given the supreme place in the individual, the family, or the community.

Taking, then, the situation as it is, while making all possible efforts towards the growth of all church members in the knowledge of the Lord and in zeal in following in His footsteps through the stewardship of life, time, and money, the one feasible solution seems to be so to reduce the expenditure as to make the available funds accomplish as much as possible. Such a policy of retrenchment will be difficult to put into operation, but for the present, until the benevolence of the church considerably improves, the possibilities of retrenchment will have to be examined seriously.

Probably all of us believe that the members of our church are not giving to the extent of their capacity. The fact that the offerings for 1928 were so very much better than for 1939 unquestionably proves that more can be given. By more and more emphasis everywhere on true Christian stewardship, and by a much more extensive use of voluntary workers, we can come much nearer the goal of self-support. The church has undoubted potentialities; until achievement reaches higher levels retrenchment seems the only solution, but it must be a retrenchment that is well thought out—one that will hinder or retard as little as possible the development of the inner life of the church, the spiritual life in which self-support must be rooted.

SELF-GOVERNMENT

I believe that in our India mission the fact that everything in our power must be done to promote the growth of a sense of self-conscious life in the church has always been before us. If we have made a mistake it has been along the line of not sufficiently realizing that people are with great difficulty trained for responsibility and that the only feasible course is to train them *in* responsibility. Synods were organized in both the Guntur and the Rajahmundry missions earlier than the merger, and the first

Indian president of the Guntur Synod was elected in 1919. As we compare those synods with our present-day synods we realize that, although Indians constituted more than half the membership, the leadership was decidedly in the missionary group, and most of the planning and the talking was done by the missionaries. That day passed; more and more Indians began to assume responsibility; Indians were appointed as chairmen of committees and did their work conscientiously, promptly, and efficiently; Indians began to make constructive suggestions for changes in policy and to present plans for new work.

One great training ground in our Andhra Church for the assuming of more responsibility has been our Taluk and Fields church councils. These are composed of the pastors of the field, the missionary or missionaries of the field, and a number of laymen, some of whom are in the employ of the church or mission, generally as catechists or school teachers. Since the Field church councils have been entrusted with the administration of the work of the synod in the various fields, i. e., the evangelistic, the congregational, and educational phases of the work, the councils have great responsibility, wield much power, and exercise very considerable authority.

Probably the financial problem that these councils are compelled to solve has called for more leadership and initiative and a greater sense of responsibility than anything else. I myself shall never forget the admirable manner in which our Kovvur-Polavaram Field Church Council, in July 1939, faced the problem of producing a balanced budget when the subsidy granted by the church was too small to cover the salaries of the workers actually employed, and when, in addition to this difficulty, a deficit of Rs 1,200—one-fifth of the annual subsidy for the field from American funds—had to be wiped out. After considering the question from many different points of view the council finally realized that nothing less than a cut of one-third of all salaries would enable the field to close the year without a deficit. The members decided to levy this terrific cut even though they knew perfectly well what sacrifices it would mean for almost every worker in the field.

The next higher body is the synod, and here also we see the

Indian Church actually at grips with problems which, though difficult, must be solved, and largely by Indians. A glance at the personnel of a synod reveals that the missionary members form a very small minority. While these synods do not carry on their work with the smooth efficiency which we see in our synods in the United States, I am sure that their organization has meant progress in the exercise by the church of self-governing functions and in the assuming of a responsibility that is real and vital. Moreover, we believe that the synods have been organized on such simple and natural lines that, even with all missionary leadership withdrawn, they could function effectively and maintain the work and life of the church at a high level of achievement.

Over the five synods we have the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church, which meets in convention every two years and corresponds to the United Lutheran Church in America. The A.E.L. Church at the top—with its membership drawn largely from the synods—coordinates the work of the synods and is definitely in charge of matters which have not been handed over to the synods. The A.E.L. Church has abundantly proved its worth and is so firmly established that it—as well as the Synods—would be able to carry on efficiently with all missionary leadership withdrawn. While it is true that up to the present no Indian pastor has served as president of the Church, a number of pastors have served as vice-president and some have secured very useful experience as presidents of synods. Furthermore, many pastors and laymen have done, and are now doing, excellent work as chairmen of important committees. We believe that a tradition of prompt and efficient handling of business, as also of spiritual awareness of the constant necessity of depending upon God for help and guidance, has been built up. We believe that the Church has found itself and that, with all its needs, faults and weaknesses, it is prepared to go forward. We are confident that through the establishment of this organization, so closely connected with the synods, field church councils, and congregations, our church has become rooted in the soil of the Andhra part of India.

Many of us were, however, dissatisfied. One reason was mentioned above—the A.E.L. Church is too large a body satis-

factorily to deliberate upon and act upon some of the questions that now come before it. The other reason is that some work which is now administered by the Mission Council ought to be administered by the Church. For these two reasons, and for the additional reason that administration by church boards has proved eminently successful in America, the Mission and the Church, as well as the Board in America, have adopted a plan for the administration of all of our work in India by boards of the church, which plan will be inaugurated, probably, on July 1, 1942. The Mission Council will continue to exist for the consideration of matters pertaining to missionaries and also to be the channel of communication between the Board at home and the Church on the field.

A very important feature of this new scheme of organization is that the boards are to have final authority within their constitutions and in the respective fields of their operations. The result of such a change in our administration will be that matters of routine and questions or action pertaining to ordinary administration will not come for final approval to the A.E.L. Church of the mission, but, as in the United Lutheran Church in America, will be finally decided by the various boards. The Executive Council of the Church which will have a membership of thirty—fifteen missionaries and fifteen Indians—will have the right of review in respect of all actions of all boards and will have authority to decide whether or not boards have overstepped their constitutionally given authority or acted upon matters outside their jurisdiction. The Executive Council must also approve the constitutions and by-laws of all boards, and alterations thereto, as also rules drawn up by the boards. The Executive Council will, however, not have the right to reverse or change an action of a board if, when taking the action, the board was acting within its constitutional authority.

The Executive Council will be composed of the five officers of the church, eighteen representatives of the boards, i. e. two from each board, and seven coopted members. At least seven of the thirty members must be women.

The A.E.L.C. Convention will elect the Executive policy, the the boards and will consider matters of general policy, the

inauguration of new work, etc., and will hear reports from the boards and act upon recommendations presented by the boards. It will exercise a control over synods and boards similar to that which is exercised by the United Lutheran Church in America over its constituent synods and its boards.

The hope is that by this proposed scheme the carrying of responsibility will become a very real thing to the members of each board. A comparatively small group will become responsible for final decisions on extremely important items of business. There can be no shifting of responsibility, as sometimes occurs when a committee is preparing recommendations which must be finally considered and acted upon by a larger body. Moreover, by this arrangement the missionary members of a board will be able to give their advice and exert their influence, but they will have no advantage over the Indian members since all the members will have the same voice and vote, and the missionaries will have no chance to discuss questions in a higher body. The board will have final authority. This scheme could continue without the missionaries and very few changes in the personnel of the boards would have to be made in the by-laws if the missionaries were compelled to leave the country. We believe, therefore, that the scheme will be found suitable for the church as a permanent part of its organization. The boards will have no connection or relationship with the Mission Council but only with the Church. They will serve the young Indian Church as training grounds and at the same time will fit into the permanent organization. Another advantage to be gained by such a scheme is the saving of time of missionaries and of Indian leaders which will certainly be effected. Think, for example, of the missionaries. As we are organized at present, all of us must, as members of the Mission Council, consider very many matters in which most of us have little interest and concerning which we know little or nothing. This means the wasting of much time by many people. No matter how thoroughly a committee may have considered a question the final decision must be made by the Mission Council. If the system of boards comes into force, the members of the board will make the final decision. Even if a board should find it

necessary to meet several times a year, the saving of time would be great since a comparatively small number of missionaries would be on any one board, and many missionaries would hold membership in not more than one board. What is true of missionaries would be true of Indians also. There would be little advantage gained if while setting missionaries free from burdensome and time-consuming meetings and thus giving them more time for evangelistic work we would so increase the administrative work of our more capable Indian leaders as to give them insufficient time and strength for aggressive evangelistic activity. It would, of course, always be possible to control this by making constitutional provision for limiting the number of boards in which any individual could hold membership.

I venture to say that in these proposals for the administration of all of the work of our Mission and Church there is evidence of the planting of our Lutheran Church in India. We may rejoice and thank God that one hundred years' progress has been so great as to make us decide to follow the home church in such an important matter as the establishment of boards, not of the mission but of the church.

Certainly much remains to be done in all directions before it can be said that the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church is really a self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing church, but we can truthfully assert that up to a certain point or to a certain degree it is actually propagating itself, supporting itself, and governing itself. In view, therefore, of what has been accomplished and of what is being accomplished today, and in view of its large membership and its trained leadership, both clerical and lay, we can praise God and say, "Here in the Andhra country the church has been planted."

OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS OF THE MINISTRY

LUTHER S. STRALEY
Athens, New York

AN UNPARALLELED opportunity to present to the public the real nature of the work of the ministry was hopelessly bungled when Warner Brothers Studio and seven men of the cloth produced the much talked about "One Foot in Heaven." A full page advertisement of the movie, appearing in church and religious periodicals, carried a letter signed by the seven members of the Advisory Committee. "As clergymen," it declared, "we consider the picture a true presentation of the ministry and worthy of our church." For all of these brethren I have a profound respect, and for one of them I have the deep affection of a loyal son devoted to a father in God, but how they could have signed such a statement about "One Foot in Heaven" is beyond the farthest reaches of my most charitable imagination.

With only one moving pastoral scene in the whole picture, the good doctor's energies were spent in spirited combat with the very people to whom he was called for the cure of souls. Of course I do not deny that the picture afforded good entertainment and gave many people much food for thought, and certainly Martha Scott's portrayal of the love, loyalty, and sacrifice of the parson's wife will long be remembered by all who saw it. But I am one clergyman who does not consider this picture a true presentation of the ministry, nor do I consider it as worthy of the church of God. If this be treason, I gladly say to all comers, make the most of it!

It is not my purpose here to outline the minister's work, but rather to point out a few of the occupational hazards of the ministry. Every occupation has its own peculiar hazards. In this respect the ministry is not different from any other work of man, for it, too, has its own peculiar hazards, and woe be unto us if we do not recognize them and guard ourselves against them. It

would be impossible, of course, to attempt even to mention all of the hazards of the ministry. The few that I will call to your attention are those which I consider to be most common to all of us and which, if not dealt with adequately, will rob our work of much of its charm and power.

I.

The first that I shall mention is the hazard of freedom, and it comes out of the fact that a minister's time, generally speaking, is his own to apportion and distribute as he pleases. I preface this by saying that the minister's time should be free and that we should not lament the fact but rejoice in it. Only we must be careful that we do not allow this freedom to lead us into an unproductive busyness or a careless idleness. I also point out the fact that this hazard is greatly increased in that we, for the most part, do not have our studies separate from the parsonage. During the course of the day it is easily possible for us to become involved in household duties which, however much they may help the pastor's wife, do not fall within the scope and compass of the pastor's working day.

On a summer's day there is the temptation to busy oneself with the lawn mower and garden tools and to take time off to do what the layman must do in his hours after work or on Saturday afternoons. There is no need for me to multiply the incidents which we all know full well can call us from the study and the desk under one pretext or another whether of necessity or the need for recreation or exercise. The layman, too, would gladly yield to these calls, but alas, he has to work for a living and he must stay with his job. His recreation, his exercise, and his odd jobs about the house must be in addition to his hours of work. We, less than the least of the laymen, must show ourselves to be the workmen of God, not slothful, but diligent, careful, and painstaking workmen.

Because the minister's work is so varied and has so many different departments it is a very easy thing for the pastor to settle his energies upon a certain few phases of the work that

appeal most to him, to the sad neglect of the others. The fact that we are free to choose what we shall do, brings the hazard of the unwise choice. It is not enough that we should be busy and fill the hours of the day and the night with work; we must be busy intelligently and with those tasks that rightfully call for the strength and energy of the man of God.

I do not believe that there is anything that will so sap the spirit of a minister as the growing consciousness that he is not accomplishing his task. He knows full well that he is a worker together with God, that he has a job that is never done, and when he finds that the days are passing and that he is not pushing ahead on all fronts, he cannot help but feel that much of the romance of his work is gone. The arteries of progressive accomplishment have become clogged and the inspiration which comes from real, honest achievement is not forthcoming. In a desperate attempt at self-justification, the pastor is likely to intoxicate himself with the notion that he is a very busy man. Habitual indulgence in this notion will result in delirium tremens, evidenced when the pastor tells you with bated breath of the tremendous strain he is under and the terrific amount of work he is doing!

Sooner or later, in one way or another, every clergyman must come to have a schedule for his work. Just how this will be worked out will depend largely upon the individual temperament of each man, together with the demands which are made by the congregation which he serves, but if he tackles this intelligently he will reap increasing dividends and he will find, too, that much of the strain has either been eliminated or turned into channels that help rather than hinder. And above all he will have the personal consciousness that he is pushing ahead, not on one front, or on a few favorite fronts, but on all fronts. An intelligent schedule will enable him deliberately to set aside time for recreation and, more important still, it will enable him to avoid bottlenecks in his work so that he will derive a certain amount of pleasure and recreation from the work itself. The amount of work that one can do when it is carefully planned is amazing, and not less amazing is the inner satisfaction which comes as the result of the consciousness of work well done.

The hazard of freedom is met and overcome when we use that freedom to good advantage. As pastors of God's flock, we ought frequently to examine ourselves concerning this hazard so that, instead of becoming a stumbling block to us, it becomes a stepping stone to higher and greater achievement for Christ and His church.

II.

The second hazard which I shall mention is that of over-confidence in ourselves as preachers. This comes out of the fact that we have to preach at least once, and some of us twice or more, each week. The frequency with which we have to stand in the pulpit will tend to make it familiar instead of holy ground if we are not constantly on the alert. We recall how in seminary days we spent hours in the preparation of a sermon, working carefully to improve the manuscript, to make sure that every idea was clear and clearly put, to make it the child of prayer, study, and hard work. And then we worked hard on the method of delivery. In those days to preach was an occasion of some consequence—especially if one were a senior in his last term and were assigned to a vacant congregation! The multiple duties of pastoral work sometimes leave little time for such exacting preparation, and the passing years should bring an increase in the technique of sermon-building. Our increasing knowledge of the Word of God, our increasing experience of God's grace as the years unfold, our intimate fellowship with God's people ought indeed count for something too. The hazard is not that the pulpit becomes familiar ground, but that it may cease to be holy. Not, of course, that any pastor would willfully take that attitude towards his sermons, or make light of the preaching office. Just the opposite is the case, and the result is that an over-confidence may develop.

I am not one who likes to weigh one function of the ministry over against another and say that this function is more important than that, for who knows just how God is planning to use us and our office for the revelation of His truth and the advancement of His Kingdom? Yet I think that all of us will agree that the preaching of the Word of God is one of the paramount functions

of the Lutheran pastor's office. In spite of the suggestion of the good rector of New York City's fashionable and historic Trinity Church that there be a moratorium on sermons, a suggestion which was received with delight by some and embarrassment by others, it is yet true that the preaching of God's Word still has a very important place in the worship of the Church of the Reformation. And if it has an important place in the life of the church, it must have a very important place in the life of the pastor. If the pastor is to preach he must spend no small amount of his time in the preparation of his sermons.

There is perhaps no more significant commentary on the charitable disposition of laymen, by and large, than their patience with the poor, weak, and often boresome sermons that almost all of us pass for the coin of the realm at some time or other. If any of us are inclined now and then to think of ourselves as preachers more highly than we ought to think, if the sin of pride besets us in this respect, let us know that we can mete out no more bitter penance to ourselves than to go back into our files and re-read some of those sermons—if indeed we have had the temerity to preserve them!

Too much of our preaching is from hand to mouth, and the situation becomes acute when the hand of the preacher is empty and the mouth of the listener is hungry for the bread of life. The sermon is not an interlude in the Service but an integral part of the divine Liturgy; therefore it must not be woven from the multi-colored cloth of current opinion, nor from the elastic textiles of individualism, nor yet from the sombre shrouds of the sacred, but dead past, but from the living fabric of the Word of God from which springs our whole Lutheran conception of worship.

I am certain, too, that our people want the preaching of the Gospel to the inspiration of their faith and to the edifying of their souls. They are not so very much concerned with the technical problems of authorship and textual criticism. They are not keenly interested in the nice problems of theology or the outstanding epochs of church history. But they are concerned with life, and they will listen eagerly when the preacher plays upon the

harp strings of their better natures, especially when he plays that melody which is the love of God.

We must therefore challenge ourselves with respect to this hazard. Are we too over-confident as preachers, and does that over-confidence cause us to fall short of the destiny to which God has called us in this prophetic office? It is not that our sermons may not be good. Rather it is the question, Are they as good as we can make them, are they with God's help the very best that we can offer to the hungry flock?

III.

The third occupational hazard of the ministry is that of bitterness or cynicism, and it comes out of the fact that as pastors we bear a very peculiar relationship to our people. One of the richest blessings in the pastor's life is that which comes from his own tender care of the souls entrusted to his shepherding. The good pastor loves his people, he prays for them, he rejoices with them, he weeps with them. He is never too busy to minister to their needs. If there is any error of neglect it is not because of an intention, and if that error be pointed out he will gladly remedy it. He will even put the most charitable construction on unreasonable demands, and he will overlook bad manners and discourtesy.

It is natural that the pastor should take his work and the church seriously. He has been called of God. He is certain of his vocation in the ministry of the Word and sacraments. To him it is the most important thing in the world. That the church, in all of its presentations, should manifest the high character of its divine spirit, that it should present to the world a true conception of the militant army of the Lord with good order and sound discipline, with comeliness and without spot or wrinkle, is ever his hope and aim. When, therefore, he sees members of his flock neglect the means of grace, when he sees them pattern more after the things of this world than the things of God, when he sees them unfaithful to their trust or slovenly in the execution of their duties in the church, when he sees them compromise with

sin and resist the overtures of grace, he is very apt indeed to feel as Samuel felt when the people of Israel insisted they wanted a king to rule over them after the manner of the pagan nations of the world.

And let us all beware of this—it is a very easy thing for the pastor to cultivate a martyr complex. Sometimes there is indeed good reason for it, for after all the pastor is human. He has feelings that can be hurt. His life, even lived in the happy company of wife and family, is more or less a lonely life. His pastoral relationship to his people naturally places him in a position where he can be cruelly hurt. Every pastor bears in his soul the wounds, some provokingly slow to heal, which have been inflicted by reason of the failure of his people to comprehend the true spiritual objective of the church, of their unwillingness to assist to the limits of their ability to manifest the strength of the church, or of their easy and carefree failure to attend public worship.

When the people do not respond to the parish program; when they permit their pastor to pray in the presence of empty pews and, what is worse, to preach to them; when they cheerfully ignore his invitation to meetings and conferences planned for the improvement of the work of the congregation, thus refusing to take their rightful part and responsibility, always reserving the privilege of criticizing and fault-finding, and sometimes laying the charge of too much central control; when they call upon him in time of trouble and then leave him sit high and dry when they are on their feet again—when all this, and more too, happens, the pastor must indeed be a saintly man if it does not get under his skin—just a little! A little irritation of the skin is not a serious disease in any man's life. Yet if it is not properly cared for it may become pernicious and, in time, lead to cancer of the soul. The pastor who has become embittered, whose optimistic faith in his fellowmen has been shattered, will never be happy in his work.

To overcome this hazard of becoming victims of bitterness and cynicism, we need an abundant supply of tolerance and a never-failing sense of good humor. Strangely enough these qualities can become rare in the ministry. As pastors we bear a peculiar relationship to our people. They look to us as the

leaders and shepherds God has given them. In a great many instances they show an attitude of respect and deference that they seldom show to others, willing that we should do as we think best, giving us the benefit of the doubt, and trusting in our judgment. In many a parish the pastor is given the privilege of saying the last word, and generally the people will try to carry out his wishes. The great majority of laymen do not like to come into open conflict with the clergy, and even if a pastor does things that they do not like, or omits other things that they desire, they are not inclined to make a public issue of it. Of course, what they may say behind his back I would not be in a position to know, although I assure you that I have no illusions about this either!

This respect and deference paid the pastor is not always easy to digest into the blood stream of his most efficient energy; it can, in fact, have the effect of a narcotic, resulting in the unseemly stupor of intolerance. There is hardly a more pathetic figure in society than the brow-beating parson who thinks he knows it all, crying the blues because his people will not be brow-beaten.

Unfortunately ordination does not confer the gift of omniscience, and unfortunately, too, the pastor may, now and then, be possessed with some very impractical ideas. In every parish there are men who by reason of their age have had a longer experience with human nature. There are also those who have the benefit of a larger experience in the business and economic world and who, because of this, can be of infinite assistance to the pastor. He must not alienate these men by insisting intolerantly upon his own views. In the long run it does not make much difference who begets the idea, or what particular method is employed, as long as it works successfully in the church to the glory of God. Our church is democratic and we must practice real democracy. This does not mean that we must have a compromising nature, or that we must yield where the fundamental teachings of the church and the principles of her faith and life are involved. There is a time when the pastor must speak with the voice of authority, but when he does so he must be sure that it is because he is really defending

the faith and acting as a spokesman for God, and not just because he wants to have his own way with men.

The constant fight against intolerance will go a long way to reduce the hazard of bitterness, and along with this we must seek to cultivate a sense of humor, not, mind you, for the sake of laughing at others, but so that we can laugh at ourselves—hale and hearty laughs. I can promise you that they will save bucketfuls of tears, and be much more constructive too. I do not mean that we must not take ourselves seriously, for we must. But not too seriously. A little humor will relieve the tension, and no man who ever has the grace to laugh at himself at times can ever fall completely into the clutches of an intolerant spirit.

A pastor must have faith in the people entrusted to his care for the cure of souls. They, too, love the church and want to be loyal to it, and it is only natural that they should wish to have a voice in setting the standards by which that loyalty is to be measured. With this in mind, it is just as important for the pastor to know how to retreat as it is to know how to advance. Sometimes these little irritations are just what we need to keep us from becoming too self-satisfied, too complacent, too self-willed. God cannot have us get out of hand, and sometimes He uses strange ways to reveal His truth to us. The far-flung lines of our hopeful endeavor may have to be recalled; we may even have to spike the guns; but never, not even for an instant, must we lose our fundamental faith in our fellowmen. It is just as important for the minister to have faith in the man at his side as it is to have faith in God above.

There are times, however, in every minister's experience when the most generous tolerance, the keenest humor, and the firmest faith in his fellowmen will not suffice to keep him from becoming bitter in his soul. When these times come he must take refuge in the citadel. This citadel, which every pastor must have, is that unflinching, uncompromising, dogmatic conviction that he is God's spokesman, that nothing can hurt him, that after all he cannot take to heart all the rough and tumble wear and tear to which the office of the ministry is subjected.

When the people of Israel clamored for a king and Samuel felt he had been rejected by the people, God reminded Samuel that, after all, it was He who had been rejected, and not Samuel. Thus the people may be unresponsive to our overtures, they may refuse to avail themselves of the means of grace, they may be disloyal to the things of God and fail to manifest His glory in the church, but in doing so they are not affronting the pastor; they are affronting God. Our citadel is the indisputable fact that we cannot take these things personally. There, with His Word and with prayer, we can have a transfiguration. There in the quiet of His presence we can get our marching orders again.

IV.

A fourth occupational hazard of the ministry is that of self-pity, and it comes out of the fact that many a pastor tries in vain to get "advancement" in the church. How many of the clergy believe, not only that they would be the better for a change of pastorates, but also that they deserve the pick of the patch, is a secret wearily and uneasily known only to those of our brethren encumbered with the enormous title of "President of Synod," and who, I hope, in the not far distant future will be called by the simple name of "Bishop." To this number, however, must be added that list of "free-lancers" whose sensitive ear is ever to the ground and who like a direct and private line to vacant charges without the medium of the synodical system. It is a natural thing for any man, surveying his work, to say, wistfully, that he could have done a better job if only better material had been provided. It is just as natural, too, for a pastor to feel that he could do better work for the Lord if the field were more promising.

Because of the fundamental assumptions underlying the call of a pastor to a congregation in the Lutheran Church, it is not possible to state, mechanically, how long or how short the pastorate should be. If one were to venture on a general statement, one would be perfectly safe in saying that the Lutheran Church encourages the longer pastorate as over against the shorter, but there have been so many short pastorates that one can hardly say that

this applies generally in practice. It is also true that many a pastor stays in his parish long after his real work there is completed, and many another leaves before his has even begun. A great deal of harm has been done to the individual cleric in our church by the persistence of the erroneous doctrine that some parishes provide opportunity for larger service in the work of the ministry. Therefore some parishes are considered as mere stepping stones to these more fruitful fields of larger opportunity. Not a few small congregations have for years given the novices a chance to continue their studies in practical theology, to put up with their mistakes, their poor preaching, their lack of understanding, only to have them leave for the so-called better fields when they reached that point where they could have begun their real work.

When one realizes that the small town and rural pastor's day is just as fully occupied as that of the city pastor, even if his telephone is not always ringing, that the relationship of the pastor to the people is the same in every parish, that one man's soul is as important as another's, and that the pastor must fill his hours with work no matter where he is, the difference does not appear so great. The difference seems even less when we realize that many a Reverend Tom, Dick, and Harry preaches sermons that are just as well centered in the Gospel, just as sound in doctrine, and have just as much meat for hungry souls as do the sermons of the Reverend Doctors Thomas, Richard and Henry whose sermons get on the radio and into the newspapers. People seldom realize that it is much easier for a man to preach to a large congregation than to a small one. Some of our brethren would find this out if, instead of having a sounding board over the pulpit to carry their words to every last pew of a well-filled church, they heard their words come jumping back at them from scores of empty seats. That a great number of them could not take it, is evidenced by the discontinuance of Vespers in many a Lutheran congregation.

When we stand before the Chief Shepherd on the last great day we will not have to give an account for the size of our flock, but we will have to account for the way we have taken care of the flock with which we have been entrusted. If we can get it into our heads that one portion of the vineyard is just as important in

the sight of God as another, if we can understand that the only "big men" in the church are those who are faithful to the task committed to them as apostolic workers together with God, and if we can have enough sense to know that human nature and church problems are universal, it would help to quiet this nervous desire for a change. Above all, it would help us to see the glorious and unlimited possibilities in our present field. The microscope is just as important as the telescope in disclosing new worlds to conquer. Of course, the small town parson will not be called back to his alma mater and be given an honorary degree with a flourishing citation, but no academic handle can improve on the title of "pastor" which belongs to every minister. His seminary is not going to ask him to give a series of lectures on preaching because they do not know of his ability, year in and year out, as a faithful preacher of God's Word. All eyes are on the man who carries the ball, and it is only the real expert of the game who sees the equally fine work that is done on the scrimmage line.

And then there is the question of salary. Many a pastor has to live on an income that is much too small to support adequately his growing family. Our church will some day have to face this question with real determination. Ours is not a lucrative calling as far as this world's goods are concerned. Sometimes it happens, too, that a small salary in one community is really larger than a higher salary in another community.

The point I am trying to make is that we must consider ourselves as God's men, doing God's work, and that all of us are equal, in that we have been committed to the same task of preaching the Word and administering the sacraments. When the full consciousness of this really dawns upon us, we will be in a better position to put our renewed energies into our work. Perhaps, after all, that is where God wants us to work. Let not the pastor weaken himself with self-pity; rather let him do the job to which God has called him, and let him do it faithfully and with joy in his heart. When the time for a change does come, and if he feels that he must make the initial step, let him do it according to the rules of the church, to the end that all things may be done decently and in order.

V.

The last hazard to which I shall refer is that of individualism, and it comes out of the fact that in the Protestant churches, the individual personality of the minister is a mighty factor to be reckoned with. Not that the individual personality of the priest of the Church of Rome is not important, for it is, but it is not encouraged by the same degree of latitude. For the Roman clergy the rubrics are not the points of departure but the basis of conformity. With strict direction for every act of the Mass around which the entire life of the Roman Church centers, with uniformity of sacerdotal vestments and ecclesiastical appointments, and with the general background of tradition and practice commonly accepted by the laity, the individual personality of the priest does not cut so large a figure, nor does it have the opportunity to express itself. And then there is the keen oversight of the bishops who, upon discovering it, would carefully prevent it from running into seed.

While we all glory in our individual liberties, we must also admit that they can be exercised unwisely, to excess, and to the confusion of the people. A pastor is called to a parish and at once the people realize that there is a new king in Egypt, but alas, too often he is one who knows nothing and cares still less about Joseph! Thus the congregation has to learn to conform to "new ways" and "new methods." If he is a stickler for following the letter of the rubrics of the Common Service Book, and if his predecessor never bothered even to read them and the congregation did not realize that they were printed in the book, the parishioners will think that he has brought a novelty into the life of the church. On the other hand, if he is inclined to take the liberal view and follows a man who was conservative, the resulting shock to the congregation will be just as great. I have known Lutheran pastors, for instance, who were very strict about confession before Communion, and who insisted that all who would receive the sacrament must be present at the Preparatory Service of Confession. On the other hand, I have known one who told his people that there was no need for this extra "formal observance" and that the people were perfectly capable of preparing themselves for receiving the sacrament.

I am sure that all of you could supply scores of incidents from your own experience and observation that would bear out this point, that individualism can become a hazard. It may reflect itself not only in the conduct of public worship, but in the pastoral relationship and in every phase and interpretation of the pastor's work. Since the formation of the United Lutheran Church and the adoption of the Common Service Book, and now particularly since the Publication House has discontinued the Book of Worship, there is unquestionably a greater uniformity than before. It is not that I am making a plea for too great uniformity in the Lutheran Church, nor that I have any illusions about the real value of uniformity even if it were an established fact. I realize that the Augsburg Confession teaches that it is not necessary for Christians to worship alike in all places, and that a charitable latitude within the bounds of decency and order must be granted to all brethren motivated by sound doctrine and good conscience. But the Augsburg Confession was written four hundred years ago, at a time when people did very little traveling and when they lived and died generally within the bounds of their native parish. Thus the variety in practice did not bring so much confusion as it does today when people travel extensively and come in constant contact with other parishes. When our people go to other communities and attend other Lutheran churches, especially those of our own synod and constitutional fellowship, they ought to feel at home in the House of the Lord.

It seems to me that as pastors of the Lutheran Church we ought to have a church consciousness that extends beyond the borders of our own parishes, and we ought to seek to build that consciousness in the lives of our people, always bearing in mind that they are not technical students of liturgics and that they may fail to recognize that omissions, additions, substitutions, or transpositions are attempts to accomplish the same ends and purposes. I doubt if we have the right to tamper with the Liturgy or garble the Service to suit our individual tastes. We may justify it on the grounds of expediency, but we are thereby sowing seeds which may one day bring forth the grapes of wrath and discord. We must know how to express our individualism so that it will edify

the whole church and not operate to the discredit of our brethren. We must use our individualism so that it will show forth the greater glory of God and not emphasize our personalities. The expression of our individual personality must be precisely along the lines of John the Baptist—we must decrease so that the One whom we represent and whom we serve might constantly increase.

It will help us to avoid this hazard if we will bear constantly in mind that some day another pastor will follow us, and even if we are not particularly disposed to make his initial years easier, our love for our people and our concern for their future happiness in the church ought to prompt us to exercise our individualism with caution, sound judgment, and discretion.

In closing I feel constrained to add a word of admiration and sincere appreciation for the good men and women of the laity with whom God has cast our lot. Their patience, their forgiving spirit, their purity of attitude toward us, and the spirit of Christian fellowship in which they have received us into their homes and family circles have gone a long way to reduce many of the hazards of our calling. Many is the time that we have gone to them to minister and returned having been ministered unto as well. The hazards of the ministry are reduced to a great extent when we know that we are among friends—friends who have a high regard for the office we bear, who show affection for us, who are patient with us, and who are sympathetic with the work we are trying to do. The cultivation of that deep and abiding friendship which is possible between a pastor and his people will go a long way to help him overcome whatever difficulties his vocation involves.

And finally I need not remind you that the last recourse and citadel of the pastor is the altar of God. Here, like the lamp of the sanctuary, there is the still small voice, ever ready to whisper the needful words of admonition and comfort. In the daily office of the Word and prayer the pastor invokes the fire from above to kindle the dying embers of his sacrifice. And the miracle of it is that the divine spark is never withheld.

NOTES AND STUDIES

INSPIRATION AND THE PITTSBURGH AGREEMENT¹

HENRY GRADY DAVIS
Maywood, Illinois

TWO conceptions of inspiration or approaches to inspiration are present in historic Lutheranism. Both these conceptions were defined at Omaha in the discussion of the Pittsburgh Agreement, and both were recognized as being present in sound Lutheranism.

The first of these two conceptions has to do chiefly with the composition of Scripture. The process of inspiration is so far defined that it can be given a descriptive adjective; it is *verbal inspiration*. It means that the words of Scripture stand as they are because the Holy Spirit put them there, just as they are. This conception of inspiration is set forth in the *Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod* (quoted in the Baltimore Minutes, p. 468). It appeals to certain proof-texts and interprets them in the light of this conception.

The second conception is harder to give a name to, precisely because the mode of inspiration is not defined at all. It is based on a more general view of the whole process of revelation which culminated in Christ and the Gospel. In this conception, inspiration is accepted as a fact, the writers being the agents God chose and used, and the product being God's Word, without any attempt whatever to define the mode of inspiration. It is set forth in the Baltimore Declaration on *The Word of God and the Scriptures* (Baltimore Minutes, 472 ff.).

In America up to now, the United Lutheran Church has been, if not the chief exponent of this second conception, at least the mightiest champion of a Lutheran's right to hold it. Our own Commission has called it our view and has contrasted it with the other view. I quote their words (Baltimore Minutes, p. 469): "It is not our judgment that we can regard their views as outside of a Lutheran conception of the Scriptures, much less that they can so regard our views."

In his appeal at Omaha for the adoption of the Pittsburgh Agreement, the President of the United Lutheran Church stated truly that there has

¹ Written at Omaha, Sunday, October 13, 1940, after the vote, by the convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, to adopt the Pittsburgh Agreement. The publication of this manuscript was postponed until now by the editors.

never been agreement on the conception of inspiration and that these two conceptions have existed and do exist. The reason why both can exist in Lutheranism is that no definition of inspiration, and no descriptive adjective as applied to inspiration, has Confessional standing. It will be noted that we have not contended that "verbal inspiration" is outside of actual Lutheran belief, but that it is extraneous to *Confessional* Lutheranism. This means our Confessions, ending with the Formula of Concord. Neither "verbal" inspiration nor any other *species* of inspiration is in our Confessions. Inspiration—yes. That Scripture is God's Word—yes. That Scripture and nothing else on earth can define doctrine—yes. That Scripture is the only infallible rule for faith and life—yes. But that inspiration *is* this or that or anything else—no.

The Pittsburgh Agreement goes beyond this. It says a unique operation "is called inspiration." Is it rightly called inspiration? Then it is inspiration. "Operation is inspiration"—"Inspiration is operation." Inspiration *is* "a unique operation . . . by which the Holy Spirit supplied content and fitting word." Does it mean to say He could supply *fitting* words without supplying words? Does this singular, "word," mean He supplied only one word? Are there then other words in the Scriptures which He did not supply? On its face value, this statement means that the Holy Spirit supplied all the words of Scripture, that the words of Scripture stand as they are because the Holy Spirit put them there, just as they are. This is verbal inspiration, and it was properly called verbal inspiration at Omaha. But it is only one, the first, of the two legitimate conceptions of inspiration. We make it official in our agreement with the American Lutheran Church; and this agreement gives no recognition at all to the second conception which was called "our view" at Baltimore.

Did we express "our view" in the Baltimore Declaration? Is the Pittsburgh Agreement also "our view"? Are they the same? Our Commission considers them so (Omaha Bulletin, p. 224): "The Commission considers these Articles (Pittsburgh) nothing more than the application to present conditions of doctrines and principles already contained in the aforesaid Confessions and Constitution (U.L.C. in A.) and in the accordant declarations and resolutions (Washington, Savannah, Baltimore)." Yet the President said in his appeal at Omaha that there was something more, "something in the Pittsburgh Agreement not in the Baltimore Declaration," namely, "recognition that there is such a thing as verbal inspiration," and said he had told the American Lutheran Commission as much in the last meeting together. There is something more, then, and it is "Verbal Inspiration." It is the first of the two legitimate conceptions, openly avowed by name. And this is not "our view." It is "their view," called by the name they use, "Verbal Inspiration." The one thing in the Pittsburgh Agreement not in the Baltimore Declaration is the view that all along we have been contrasting

with our own view; it is the opposite view to the one set forth in the Baltimore Declaration. It would have been in order for us at Omaha to recognize "their view" as within sound Lutheranism. What we did, however, was to adopt "their view" as our own. Does anybody suppose that we have really changed from "our view" to "their view" in two years? Or, do we really hold either of these views? Or, perhaps there are not two conceptions at all, but only one! Any supposition can hold now!

So now the doctrine of verbal inspiration stands canonized, in our latest (and, if the Commission's judgment prevails, our last) doctrinal pronouncement, as one prerequisite for any move toward closer relations. It stands without qualification of any sort. It is unqualified by any acknowledgment that there is a second legitimate conception within sound Lutheranism. It is unqualified by any word of denial that mechanical dictation is meant; and what more could dictation supply besides content and words? It is unqualified by any hint that this is an extra-confessional agreement for practical purposes. It must be remembered that not the Commission's report but only the text of the Agreement will be promulgated.

The word "errorless" likewise stands unqualified. It is spoken here of the Bible just as it stands. It is not qualified by any hint to the unwary that it doesn't mean the Bible as we have it, but means only the originals—a qualification the strongest believers in verbal inspiration are careful to make. Dr. Reu says it ("In the Interests of Lutheran Unity," p. 71): "We repeat, the inerrancy is to be ascribed only to the original copies. Not a few wonder about this limitation, but hardly with good reasons. We speak here of the operation of the Spirit upon the holy writers called inspiration, and this was active not in the preservation of the existing copies, but in their production." (He goes on to show an obvious error of fact in the Bible and to admit others.) There is no such qualification as this in the Pittsburgh Agreement. It is all stated as of our present Bible just as it is, and will of course be so understood.

Finally, the Pittsburgh Agreement was adopted as one which, in the Commission's judgment (Omaha Bulletin, p. 225), we should now adopt and faithfully abide by. It was stated at Omaha that adopting it would make no essential difference. Do we not mean to abide faithfully by this agreement? Will faithfully abiding by it make no difference? Will faithfully abiding by it in the class-room mean ceasing to teach or countenance the more general conception of inspiration, and teaching verbal inspiration as here set forth? Will it mean closing our publication channels to all literature that smacks of the second rather than the first conception of inspiration and Scripture? What else that usually goes with verbal inspiration will it mean? The Convention at Omaha did not discredit its Commission or its head. The issue at Omaha was carried, but it was not settled. The issue in class-room and parish is now raised for the first time. If this

Agreement stands, it will gall the shoulders of faithful teachers for decades to come.

In view of these things, some of us claim the right of holding the other of the two conceptions "within the scope of historic, Confessional Lutheranism," the second conception as defined in the Baltimore Declaration, not the verbal conception. We reserve the right to repudiate the Pittsburgh Agreement as a statement of our belief about inspiration and as the required basis of any closer relations to other Lutheran bodies. We feel that it is a surrender by ourselves, and on demand, of that one of the two legitimate conceptions which we have called our own, without any recognition of it whatever. We claim the right to retain this view and to teach it. We stand ready to acknowledge the other view as legitimate for those who hold it. But we should refuse to enter any relationship that denies an equal right to ours.

Ardently desiring Lutheran unity, we take this position in the firm conviction that the Lutheran Confessions themselves afford the only basis on which unity is possible, and that to bring in issues which do not have Confessional standing makes for confusion and disunity rather than peace.

TRENDS IN RECENT THEOLOGY

JOHN ABERLY
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

PERHAPS our first task is to delimit our subject. What theology can be called recent? A few years ago the late Dr. H. R. Mackintosh wrote a standard work on *Modern Types of Theology*. His starting point is Schleiermacher (1764-1834), early in the nineteenth century. More recently Dr. Walter C. Horton wrote a book on *Contemporary English Theology*. Here he considers the Anglo-Catholic type which goes back to the Oxford Movement, the central trend of which the Archbishop of York is the chief exponent, and the liberal type represented by Jacks, Inge, Tennant, and even Barnes and Rashdall. Horton followed with a book on *Contemporary Continental Theology*. Here he includes such Roman Catholics as Maritain, the French theologian, and Przywara, the Austrian; exiled Greek Orthodox theologians, as represented by the layman, Bardyaev, and the cleric, Bulgakoff; German and Swiss theology as represented by Karl Barth, Dr. Hauer, Rosenberg, and Hirsch; and the Swedish or Lund School as represented by Nygren and Aulén. In addition Dr. E. E. Aubrey has discussed *Tendencies in Modern Theology* under the dialectical theology of Barth and Brunner, Neo-Thomism as represented by Maritain, and Modernism.

In some theological seminaries, the Philosophy of Religion has taken the place of Theology. Here we find not a few varieties. Wieman and Meland classify *American Philosophies of Religion* as follows:

Traditional supernaturalism—Machen et al.
 Neo-supernaturalism—Tillich et al.
 Absolutist Idealists—Hocking et al.
 Modern mystics—Rufus Jones et al.
 Ethical Intuitionists (philosophical)—D. C. Mackintosh et al.
 Ethical Intuitionists (theological)—William Adams Brown.
 Aesthetic Naturalists—Santayana et al.
 Evolutionary Theists—Calhoun et al.
 Cosmic Theists—Whitehead et al.
 Religious Humanists—Haydon et al.
 Empirical Theists—Shailer Matthews et al.

It has been said that we have no philosophies any more—only philosophers. One is tempted to add that we do not have any systems of theology—only theologians.

In some of our leading seminaries, instead of teaching a system of theology, the study of theology consists in making the student acquainted with the great systems of theology worked out by men since the time of Augustine. An article by Dr. Raymond W. Albright, professor at the United Evangelical School of Theology at Reading, Pa., has proposed a list of the great works of the past which ought to constitute the standard course in theology.¹ It is bringing the five-foot shelf, the library of the liberally educated man, into the sphere of education for the ministry. Acquaintance with these, so it is argued, would enable the student to construct his own system of theology. This may be noted as a trend advocated by few, followed by more, but fortunately not yet accepted by theological schools in general.

There are, however, certain subjects in theology which have received special emphasis in recent times. They may help one to understand recent trends in theology.

The first, and possibly the chief, of these subjects is that of revelation. A composite book under the editorship of John Baillie discusses the subject from different angles. The subject was no doubt brought into prominence by Karl Barth. One of his earliest books was on *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. His projected dogmatics, of which only the first part has been finished, has as the title of the first volume *The Word of God*. The thesis in part, as in all his writings, is that God is so entirely the Totally Other that we are entirely dependent upon His revelation of Himself in Christ Jesus to know Him or even about Him.

1 See *The Christian Century*, Sept. 3, 1941.

From the time of Schleiermacher on, Christian experience has been given prominent place in paths that lead to God. One of the latest series of books that make this approach to theology is the Library of Constructive Theology—*God in Christian Experience*, *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*, the *Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, etc. The Erlangen School, in its teaching about religious certainty, laid great stress on it—the witness of experience to the fact that Jesus saves. Then Ritschl followed with his value judgments, his rejection of all metaphysical statements as part of Christian doctrine, and reconciliation of men with God and with one another in a new community—the social order. The Christian mystic was not unheard of, for, as K. H. Saunders said, he is after all the specialist in religion. Then came the World War with its deflation of man and all his works. Barth himself said, you cannot say God by shouting man in a loud voice. Not by spelling Man or Humanity with a capital letter do we reach the divine. Barth takes the view that such an approach is a hindrance and not a help to the knowledge of God. It is only when, with Romans three, we learn that the whole world is guilty before God—that we are utterly undone—that we are prepared to listen to God's way of righteousness. It is thus that Christ comes as the Revelation of God. In moments of crisis that call for decision He can and does reveal Himself to the bankrupt soul. This want of capacity to know God by searching for Him is due not only to man's selfishness but to the very fact that Creator and creatures are entirely distinct. Eternity is not just an infinite number of finite units of time added together. They too are entirely distinct. One can only know God by a special revelation, and that has been given in Christ. This rules out all natural theology (Barth's Gifford Lectures). It also rules out all mysticism which believes that we can know the Beyond because it is akin to us. It ought yet to be added that his theology was called Crisis Theology both because all stand under the judgment of God and because it is times of crisis that furnish the occasion and, with the occasion, the necessity and power of making decisions; it is in the light of such crises—or in their darkness—that even Scripture becomes the Word of God to us.

They say that Barthianism has had its day. Barth himself did not desire to make a system. His system is indeed unfinished. His influence was in shaking the church out of its sweet complacency that

God's in His heaven
All's right with the world;

out of the shallow optimism of the evolutionary outlook that we all are moving ever onward and upward till earth shall become heaven. It called men to the dark tragedy of sin, and to the central facts of salvation that

comes through an act of God by which He meets this guilty world with a Gospel of forgiveness. And this is revelation. This is the Word of God.

The Niebuhrs (Reinhold and Richard) are in this succession. Reinhold Niebuhr's *Beyond Tragedy* and especially his *Nature of Man*, over and over again point out that our age has erred because it does not take account of the depth of man's sin. It calls us back to the Reformation standpoint that Theology is Christology and Christology is Soteriology. And this is not brought about by God's revelation—"When it pleased God to reveal His Son."

Kraemer's *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* follows this same trend. It set itself against the syncretism that would distil the essence of all religions and call that the Christian message. It, as Barthianism in general, may have taken an extreme position (as is common with those who champion a neglected truth just rediscovered) in denying all values to what other religions have worked out in presenting the Christian message. Dr. Reichelt, a Lutheran missionary among Buddhists in China, thinks so. But as a needed correction to the Humanism that would make revelation little more than human discovery, it has rendered a real service to theology and the new conservatism in theology acknowledges it.

Before passing on to the next subject, it ought to be stated that the Lund school in Sweden uses different terminology but adopts a similar standpoint, as in Nygren's *Eros and Agape*, contrasting human love with divine love, a distinction which Barth expresses in calling God the Totally Other. Asked whether after all this was not Barthianism, one of the Lund school replied that the Swedish theologians, following historical researches, specially of Reformation times, worked it out independently. We shall come to one of Lund's chief contributions when we consider the atonement.

It may be of interest that Dr. Hauer, one of the authors of the German Faith Movement, shows traces of crisis theology. Times of crisis, he believes, have made clear that God is speaking to the nation now in its need and that this reveals the necessity of a religion of race, soil, and blood. It is along this line that theologians in Germany who started with Barth could easily turn and defend the new German Faith. The parting point comes, however, here that they preach another Christ than the one we have revealed in the Scriptures.

At any rate all this emphasizes the importance of a restudy of revelation. Without giving reasons, I cannot but believe that God reveals Himself in all His works—in creation which is the act of God and reveals Him, in the spirit of man which, spite of the ravages of sin, has not wholly lost its kinship with God as it follows its highest ideals, but fully and finally in the Gospel message of salvation by grace in our Lord Jesus Christ.

This brings us to another subject related to revelation, and that is the meaning of history. Does it have any meaning? India in its age-long

speculations did not think so. Neither did Greece. On the other hand, the prophets of the Old Testament were interpreters of history. All Christology is in the final analysis an attempt to interpret a unique fact in history. The Acts of the Apostles are the acts of the Holy Spirit in history. The importance of history needs to be stressed in theology.

In the October number of the *Expository Times* attention is called to a new volume by Dr. J. S. Whale, of Cambridge. About this book the editor of the *Expository Times* comments: "Christianity has from the beginning possessed a doctrine of history. The clue to it is supplied by the idea of the Kingdom of God. It is a Kingdom which is not of this world. It lies behind the varied panorama of this world. But it breaks in upon this world, manifesting itself to them that have eyes to see. On this account it involves a special reading of history, a sacred as distinguished from a secular reading. The Bible is a history book, but it gives secular history in a framework of sacred history which began in Paradise and will end in the New Jerusalem." This distinction between profane and holy history is the subject of Prof. Piper's recent book, *God in History*. Paul Tillich along similar lines sees in history a conflict between divine and demonic forces—albeit the demonic are understood to be a misuse of that which is divine. Is there purpose in history? Is there a power not ourselves that makes for righteousness? Is the Eternal working out something in the temporal? Are even world catastrophes judgments whereby God would have men learn righteousness?

This idea of conflict lies behind the idea of the atonement in Aulén's *Christus Victor*. Ever since a theory of the atonement was framed by Anselm, what is known as the patristic view has been thought to belong to an outgrown age. In its cruder form all that we used to hear about it was that it believed that Christ's death for our deliverance was really a ransom paid to the devil. This, of course, has been left behind. But both Aulén in his *Christus Victor* and Brunner in his *Der Mittler* go back to Irenaeus. Both found strong support in Luther also for the view of the atonement that represents it as a victory over Satan by God in Christ. Anselm in his *Cur Deus Homo* made it the work of the *Man* Christ Jesus, for at that time all followed the old Aristotelian view that God is passionless. A conflict then of God in history with the powers of evil in which through *Christus Victor* we have been reconciled to God—this is the old-new view of the atonement. And it is finding a large following among the new conservatives in our day.

Then there is a new emphasis on the church. Morrison's study of the subject was due to the impression made on him at the Oxford Conference. I have only read reviews of Morrison's book, but from these I infer that he comes near to those who equate Christianity with the church. It leans toward the Roman Catholic conception, *ubi ecclesia ibi Christus*, rather than the Protestant view, *ubi Christus ibi ecclesia*. The fact must be admitted

that in our theology we have given the church too subordinate a place—a sort of addendum to our doctrine of the Word and the Sacraments. That may be responsible for empty churches. The view that it is only in the community that we can see Christ's body, that the Spirit is given to a fellowship, even as at Pentecost, and that in this fellowship under the guidance of the Spirit new insights and new applications of the Gospel are to be found—this is what this view of the church seeks to express.

Along this same line there is new stress on the catholicity of the church. They call it ecumenicity. Princeton Seminary is, I believe, the first to have a Chair of Ecumenicity. That it takes the whole church with all the gifts of each several part to set forth the whole Christ—this is what makes ecumenicity so urgent. Archbishop Temple would go so far as to hold that the Eucharist will not be a complete Eucharist until it is a communion authorized by the whole church. While not expressing such a view, Brillioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice* has, it seems to me, its chief value in showing, not that our view of the Lord's Supper is true and all others false, but in presenting the truth found in all the views that have had large following. Its comprehensiveness is its virtue even though he is very partial to the High Church or Oxford Movement.

In going over these trends I have so far not tried to present what is known as Neo-Thomism. It may be well to recall that Thomas Aquinas was Spanish, that he lived in a time when, through the Moors there, Aristotle had been introduced to Christian thinkers and that he attempted to unite the doctrines of Christianity with Aristotle. He did it by allowing to Aristotle the reign of natural theology with its first cause and final cause, thus proving the existence of God, but turning to revelation for a knowledge of God as triune and for all the saving work of God. Thus you have mixed doctrines and pure doctrines. In Ethics you have pagan virtues and Christian graces—faith, hope, and love. It delivers from the fragmentariness of our age of specialization and gives a comprehensive view in which all knowledge can be included. It is for this reason that we are told that Chicago University has re-enthroned Thomas. And Dr. Paul Tillich says that he finds himself more at home in that atmosphere than in the monistic atmosphere of the schools nearer home that want to limit us to the empirical, to the order of the created. In this one can concur. To us Lutherans a return to Neo-Thomism is not so difficult. A theology such as Dr. Valentine's has always kept us within its bounds. To those who look on it as something new, one can only say what has been said recently: "If you want new ideas, read old books; if you want old ideas, read new books."

Let me be clear and again state that there is no trend that can be said to appear everywhere. There are still those who would make Christianity exclusively interested in making things good here and who do not care for

doctrine. We need those who represent the application of the Gospel to human need, individual and social. It has been said with a good deal of justification that Lutheranism has been so concerned with *Innerlichkeit* that it has been inclined to forget this side. The Reformed tradition has been so absorbed in the practical application of the Gospel as to obliterate the eternal distinction between the world and the Kingdom of God. Let us correct our defects by the virtues of others. But let us also hold fast that which is good in what we do have. The trend is decidedly towards a new conservatism. Let Christianity be itself; let the church be the church. Perhaps no better advice can be given to us now than was given by the earliest Christian theologian, St. Paul, in one of his earliest Epistles: Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

GREGORY HEIMBURG, A FIFTEENTH CENTURY CONCILIARIST

ERNEST D. NIELSEN
Des Moines, Iowa

I.

GREGORY HEIMBURG'S date of birth is unknown. However, scholars agree in placing it at or near the beginning of the year 1400. Less unanimity exists in regard to his place of birth, Clemens Brockhaus stating that Gregory Heimburg was born in Würzburg, and Paul Joachimsohn tracing him to Schweinfurt.¹ Since Clemens Brockhaus' erroneous conclusion with respect to the place of birth is due to a later discarded hypothesis regarding the ancestors of Gregory Heimburg, it is apropos here to enter upon a more detailed investigation. Brockhaus sees in the name Gregor von Heimburg, as he is always called in official communications, an indication of noble birth, and says that he is of *Adelsgeschlecht*. Since Brockhaus wrote, documents have been made available to scholars which conclusively prove that Gregory Heimburg was not born in Würzburg, nor did he belong to any titular class. The discovery of the document setting forth his duties as a consultant attorney for the Teutonic Orders settles the question of whether to call him Gregory von Heimburg or simply Gregory Heimburg.² In this

1 Clemens Brockhaus, *Gregor von Heimburg*, p. 1; Paul Joachimsohn, *Gregor Heimburg*, pp. 1, 288-91.

2 E. Schneider, "Eine Urkunde Gregor's von Heimburg" in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, VI (1883), pp. 113-14. This document is a contract between the Teutonic Order and Gregory Heimburg. It states the duties of his office under Ludwig von Erlichshausen, who was head of the Order during 1450-1467. Joachimsohn does not list this document in his list of sources. Cf. Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 292-301.

document he speaks of himself as "Gregor Heimburg." Consequently we have adopted this form. When he is called Gregor von Heimburg by *others*, although he never used this form, it speaks volumes for the respect accorded him in social circles where he moved freely.

Gregory Heimburg was reared in what appears to have been a well to do home. His father, Hans Heimburg, enjoyed considerable prestige among his fellow citizens. As a public official he served his city as mayor four times. The first time we find him holding this office is in 1339 and the last time is in 1427. He also functioned as an envoy to the Council of Constance in 1414.³ Apart from this meager information we know practically nothing of the other members of his childhood home. He married Christine Lorber, whose family came from Würzburg, and one son and three daughters were born to them.⁴ He was a thoroughgoing German whose love for his country influenced his whole life.

Gregory Heimburg attended several schools in Germany, but there is evidence extant to show that he never matriculated at any German university. Knowing that the cities, as a whole, were anti-clerical, one wonders whether this kept his father from allowing him to frequent the cathedral schools. At any rate, he turned his attention to Italy. We do not know when he began his studies of jurisprudence at the University of Padua, but somewhere around 1430 he received the degree of doctor of canon and civil law.⁵

Upon his entrance at the university two major fields of interest claimed his attention, the humanities and law. He finally chose the study of law and entered upon his studies with much enthusiasm. Gregory Heimburg held a high conception of law. The fact that he studied law at a time when Padua had several well-known jurists on its faculty—Prosdicinus de Comitibus, Paulus Doctus, Jacobus de Zocchis, and Heinricus de Alano—no doubt contributed to his high estimate of law, which he termed the true philosophy.⁶ This absorbing interest in jurisprudence also had a humanistic element. He entered as wholeheartedly into the study of civil law as canon law. That is interesting when we know that there was a definite attempt on the part of the popes to prevent the study of civil law "from a disposition . . . to establish exclusively their decretals."⁷ The revival of the study of civil law spread with great rapidity, and the schools of law at the uni-

3 Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

4 Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 290, 291; *Testament Gregor Heimburg's* in Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 294-97.

5 Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

6 "Die wahre Philosophie und Rechtsgelehrsamkeit."

7 Henry Hallans, *View of the State of Europe During the Middle Ages*, p. 649. Cf. same work for a description of the codes in the canon law, pp. 350-51; also, for a Roman Catholic view, H. J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, pp. 1-7.

versities of Naples, Padua, and Bologna became famous for their regard for civil law. The great majority of law students later received orders in the church, but Gregory Heimburg remained a layman throughout his life. As such he occupies a singular position among the conciliarists.

The century before the birth of Gregory Heimburg had witnessed political, social, and religious developments which in the course of time affected his outlook upon the issues of his day. Politically, the Golden Bull of Charles IV (1356) settled the question of the electoral college. The number of electors was limited to seven; the place of coronation, Aix-la-Chapelle; and the archbishop of Cologne was to perform the religious ceremony of coronation. Socially, the cities had grown and prospered and reached the point where they were allowed to send deputies to the Diet. Generally speaking, the cities manifested a freedom in thought and action which made them suspicious, if not outright enemies, of the nobility and the prelates. Religiously, or rather ecclesiastically, it was a contest for power between various parties. The removal of the papal court to Avignon and the great schism raised questions which to some minds foreshadowed a catastrophic doom, to others heralded the dawn of a new day.⁸ On the question of the church and its relation to the existing ecclesiastical government we find Gregory Heimburg among the champions of conciliarism; the lay representative of conciliarism in his day.

Upon the completion of his formal education Gregory Heimburg returned to Germany and selected the city of Nürnberg as a promising center for his future career. On May 5, 1430, he entered the service of Archbishop Konrad and, on June 21, the archbishop appointed him his General Vicar in ecclesiastical affairs. The unprecedented action on the part of the archbishop lies not in the fact that Gregory Heimburg was a jurist, but that he was a layman. Certainly the general practice was in sharp contrast to this procedure. His biographers have nothing to relate about his two years of service under Konrad. It is only a preliminary chapter which

8 How even to this day the defenders of the papacy fail to appreciate the ideas of men like Marsilius of Padua may be seen in H. J. Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 445. Speaking of the development of the conciliar theory, which he in its first "glimmerings" traces to the conflict between Phillip the Fair and Boniface VIII, "when the former appealed from the latter to a future general council, the implication being that the council is superior to the pope," he says: "In the course of its development it became associated with other ideas still more inimical to the papacy. It reappeared in the bitter struggle of Louis of Bavaria and the fanatical Fratricelli against John XXII. It grew in power and proportion under the pens of that evil genius of the fourteenth century, William of Ockham, of Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno, all three professors at the University of Paris, the latter two collaborating in the composition of the famous or rather infamous *Defensor Pacis*, a work directed against John XXII and replete with the crudest revolutionary ideas." Also, cf. John T. McNeill, "The Emergency of Conciliarism" in *Medieval and Historiographical Essays in Honor of James Westfall Thompson*, ed. Cate; and see *Readings in European History*, Vol. I, pp. 491-97, by James Harvey Robinson.

shows us his early contact with ecclesiastical dignitaries of his day. No doubt the experience gained during these two years paved the way for his later activity in the public life of his people and nation.⁹

II.

Our modern desire for speedy action as well as the clock-like precision with which we respond to the official convocation of our respective church conventions stand in sharp contrast to the Council of Basel, which was so long in assembling that "its first business was to increase its numbers."¹⁰ The greatest impediment to travel was the very unsafe condition of the highways by reason of the Hussite War and the armed conflict between Burgundy and Austria.

Gregory Heimburg did not arrive at Basel before the last week in November, 1432. He came together with the diplomatic corps of the electors, but that he especially represented the archbishop of Mainz is revealed by the fact that he was the chief spokesman of the diplomatic corps.¹¹ A relatively short time before the arrival of Gregory Heimburg, the Council divided into committees in order to undertake its objectives, which included the suppression of heresy, the establishment of peace in Europe, and reform within the church *in capite et membris*.¹²

Gregory Heimburg was devoid neither of pride nor of a sense of importance as he appeared before the assembly on November 29, 1432, to address this august body of worldly and ecclesiastical princes. This first public address on behalf of conciliarism marks the formal dedication of his life and career to a conception of the nature of the church which profoundly influenced his religious thinking and life. That he should take a New Testament text—a Pauline passage—as a theme for his address is, indeed, typically characteristic of those reformers who saw in the status of the church a fatal departure from the thought and life of the primitive church.

9 Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-8.

10 Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 458 says, "The attendance at the beginning was very small. It increased in 1432, and in 1434 numbered 300 delegates. On the day on which the council was supposed to have opened (March 4, 1431) there was present only one delegate. A month later five more arrived, including the representatives of the University of Paris." And M. Creighton, *A History of the Papacy During the Period of Reformation*, says, "Deeply impressed with the importance of the crisis, he [i. e. Cesarini, who arrived at Basel on September 9, 1443] sent forth letters urging on the prelates that they should lose no time in coming to the Council. Only three bishops, seven abbots, and a few doctors were assembled . . .," p. 62; cf. p. 57.

11 "Sprecher der Gesandtschaft."

12 L. Elliott Binns, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Medieval Papacy*, lists the four committees as follows: committee on peace in Christendom, *deputatio pacis*; committee on faith and doctrine, *deputatio fidei*; committee on reform of the church, *deputatio reformationis*; and committee on general business, *deputatio communis*, p. 207.

He selected Philippians 3:17 as a text, "Mark them that so walk even as ye have us for an example." Gregory Heimburg employed the homiletical method of his own age which was influenced by the rhetorical practices of the humanists and the polemical writers. To find a sure foundation for his discourse he spanned millennia and started with the creation story.

He speaks of the creation of man, of his soul, and of how it is nourished by the divine law uttered through the prophets. The life and death of Jesus give men eternal blessedness. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles is a visible manifestation of divine power. We must follow this pattern and pray for grace if we would apprehend these divine deeds. Gregory Heimburg cautiously avoids discussing whether the first General Council (Council of Nicea, 325) was called by the emperor or the pope. The words of the Master suffice: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."¹³ The first four General Councils he compares with the four streams in the land of Eden¹⁴ and the four Gospels, and they take precedence before all the Church Fathers and popes in honor and reverence. There is a mystical union which knows of no distance between the Council and Basel and Gregory the Great or Peter. This mystical union creates a oneness, a solidarity, and through the Holy Spirit the assembly is so tied to the Spirit that it cannot err.¹⁵ The community which constitutes the council¹⁶ is not any different from that of a state or city. The chief essence of a community is not that it is surrounded by a protective wall, but that its citizens live under a governing law. Although the problem of settling the troubles and the confusion produced by war does not involve a question of faith, nevertheless according to the proclamation of the Angel, peace is the salvation of man, and, therefore, it is the task of the church to induce peace. He promises, on behalf of the electors, wholehearted cooperation toward the accomplishment of this most difficult task. For the settlement of the dispute between the pope and the council, he announced the intention of the electors to send envoys to the pope, Eugene IV. Finally he presented to

13 Matthew 18:20.

14 Genesis 2:10-14. The streams are: Pison, Gihon, Hiddekel, and Euphrates.

15 For the idea of infallibility as pertaining to a general council, Schroeder, *op. cit.*, says, "In their addresses they [the plenipotentiaries of the pope] pointed out among other things that the authority of the pope is of divine origin. . . . The pope alone possesses the *plenitudo potestatis*. . . . In reply the council maintained the superiority of a general council over the pope in all things that pertain to faith, to the extirpation of schism, and to the reformation of the church. Only God and a general council are infallible. Many popes have erred. The history of the church, the writings of the Fathers, and the decrees of Constance furnish proof of the superiority of a general council" (p. 460). L. Elliott Binns, *op. cit.*, says that Pope John XXIII "even went so far as to recognize the infallibility of the council" (Concilium . . . scio errare non posse), p. 191.

16 "Die Gemeinschaft des Konzils."

the council a petition for the postponement of the charge of contumacy against the pope and the cardinals.¹⁷

Gregory Heimburg did not give his foremost attention to the problem of the relation between the council and the papacy and the empire. On the contrary, he intentionally pushed it aside for that which to him, as a conciliarist, was the weightier and fundamental problem, the problem of the authority of a council. In his mind there was not the slightest doubt that the community of believers by virtue of an eternally natural law possessed a power which they could exercise.

At the end of the year 1432 the envoys left Basel for Rome, and Joachimsohn advances the conjecture that Gregory Heimburg, by virtue of his position and unquestioned ability, was among the emissaries.

The result of the pressure brought to bear upon Eugene IV led to a gradual modification of his earlier attitude and through a series of events culminated in the famous papal bull *Dudum sacum* in which the pope "declared that he was willing and content (*volumus et contentamur*) that the council should continue as if nothing had happened, and that he would cooperate with it to the fullest extent of his power, provided his legates be admitted as presidents with all the powers and jurisdiction that go with that office, and that all the decrees issued against himself and his cardinals be withdrawn. The council, however, was dissatisfied with the wording, *volumus et contentamur*, for it implied mere toleration and not the approbation that it wished, and hence it rejected even this latest concession. It desired those words to be replaced by *decernimus*, a word that the Pope deliberately avoided because it would have meant his approval of all the decrees that had till then been issued against him and against the prerogatives of the Holy See. . . . Eugene yielded to the council and on December 15, in a bull, accepted the formula *decernimus et declaramus*, withdrew the bull of dissolution, recognized the council as ecumenical from its inception and to be continued as if nothing had happened for the threefold purpose agreed upon in the opening session."¹⁸

The Council of Basel reached the highest development of the conciliar idea. That the reformers' expectations were sadly disappointed during the subsequent years must be traced primarily to the continuous clash between personal interests on the part of those who constituted the council.

Of the high esteem in which Gregory Heimburg was held in the Council of Basel, Enea Silvio¹⁹ says that he was one of those three men whose remarkable learning called forth the admiration of the entire council. The two others were Nikolaus von Cusa and Thomas Ebendorfer. Both of these

17 Cf. M. Creighton, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-85.

18 Schroeder, *op. cit.*, pp. 462-63.

19 Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

men turned away from conciliarism whereas Gregory Heimbург continued to champion its cause. Here at Basel he gained prominence as an eloquent speaker, he learned much about statesmanship, and he saw great opportunities for reform, which unfortunately did not greatly materialize.

III.

On February 4, 1435, Gregory Heimbург took the oath of office as city attorney for the city of Nürnberg. His tenure of office was five years. During this period he handled several important law suits which at that time attracted considerable attention and increased the legal prominence already associated with his name.²⁰ His function as "*Jurist und Diener*" did not bar him from taking an active part in the task of mediation between the papacy and the council.

The victory of the Council of Basel over Pope Eugene IV did not guarantee against any future hostility. In fact, it seems that the victory was rather one of theory or principle than of actuality. The new strife which was to cause a new schism and a new rival pope, Felix V, arose because of the double negotiations between the Greeks and the pope and the council on the question of a suitable place for a meeting to discuss the subject of reunion between the Greek and the Latin churches. The record shows a virtual race between the papacy and the council; it is a race in which diplomacy, intrigue, momentary inducements, and extreme measures all play their part. Briefly, the pope won the adhesion of the Greeks and transferred²¹ the council to Ferrara on December 30, 1437, or January 1, 1438, and here the council commenced its business on January 8, 1438. To show something of the corresponding alertness of the council, it suffices to indicate that the council found Eugene IV guilty of contumacy on October 1, 1437, suspended him from his high office on January 24, 1438, and deposed him on June 25, 1439. Due to the plague which cost the lives of five thousand people in Basel, the election of a new pope was postponed for a period of sixty days. On November 5, 1439, Amadeus VIII, Duke of Savoy, was elected to the papacy and took the name of Felix V.

The facts are that this strife had reached the level where genuine interest on the part of people no longer could be retained. Men grew weary over an issue that seemed endless and fruitless as far as tangible

²⁰ Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 43, 44, 98.

²¹ The modern Catholic historians contend that the council at Ferrara was not a new council but the continuation of the Council of Basel. Of course, it is a question of interpretation whether to speak of it as the dissolution or the transfer of the council. Considering the schism it created and the conciliar principles underlying a general council it does involve more than a transfer. Cf. Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 467, and Creighton, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

and observable evidences of reform were concerned. The result was what is commonly called the German neutrality.

The Emperor Sigismund refused to take part in the issue. His death, December 9, 1437, closed forever the hope still entertained by many that he would intervene. M. Creighton states the attitude of Sigismund in these words: "He disapproved of the Pope's dissolution of the Council, from which he still expected some measures of ecclesiastical reform; on the other hand, he disapproved of the Council's proceedings against the Pope, which threatened a renewal of the schism."²² Thus we see the political repercussions of the ecclesiastical conflict. The electors, who also favored neutrality, publicly announced their views on March 17, 1438, the day prior to their election of Albert, Duke of Austria and King of Hungary, as successor to Sigismund. This declaration was probably written, in whole or in part, by Gregory Heimburg, who possessed first hand knowledge of the history of the schism, of proceedings at Basel as well as of the Diet of Frankfort.²³ Gregory Heimburg sees in the German neutrality a means to an end, namely appeasement. Consequently he approves of its measures, which involved a new principle of administration. The electors definitely asserted that they intended to take into their own hands the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in their respective dioceses and territories. Yes, he wanted the pope to give the king free reins to select a new place for a new ecumenical council. In case this suggestion meets with the approval of the pope, he will have the full support of the king and the electors.

The new archbishop of Trier, Jacob von Sirk,²⁴ at the Diet of Mainz circulated a work "urging the acceptance of whichever Pope would summon a new Council, to be organized by nations, and to guarantee to the German Church the reforms which it had claimed for itself. In accordance with this plan the Diet laid before the rival parties the old proposal that a new Council should be summoned in some neutral place with the concurrence of the kings of Europe."²⁵ August 1, 1442, was set as a date for this proposed council. The diet sent Gregory Heimburg to Florence, Italy, as an ambassador empowered to represent the Diet. He presented two bulls, of which the first set forth the proposal for a new ecumenical council; it also adhered to the principle of the superiority of the decisions of Constance and Basel. The second treated of the rights of the German church and called for a unification of the reform legislation enacted at Basel, for the willingness of Eugene IV to abolish reservations and expectancies, for the right of election of bishops to be given to the chapters, for appeals to Rome to be forbidden,

²² Creighton, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

²³ Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-55.

²⁴ Jacob von Sirk succeeded the aged Archbishop Raban of Trier, who resigned from the bishopric in 1439.

²⁵ Creighton, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

and for the pope to recognize all actions by the king or the electors during the neutrality.²⁶ The actual results of this mission is not quite clear. The pope found a pretext for refusing to answer Gregory Heimbürg in the fact that he did not carry any credentials. He would not consent to deal with him as a private individual. He informed him that he would send his reply with his ambassador to the next German Diet.²⁷ Joachimsohn insists that the practice of sending envoys without letters of accreditation was not uncommon in the Middle Ages.

Frederick III, who had been elected to the empire on February 1, 1440,²⁷ pursued the most selfish policy imaginable. Always finding himself in financial difficulties, he practically sold himself to the pope. Eugene IV was to pay him, in addition to other benefices, 210,000 ducats, of which 121,000 were to be paid by Eugene IV and the rest by his successors.²⁸ The pope deposed the archbishops of Cologne and Trier on January 24, 1446, charging them with being heretics and schismatics. The electors retaliated quickly by forming an Electoral League in March of the same year. The electors proceeded to prepare resolutions to be presented before Frederick III and Eugene IV. Here, again, we meet Gregory Heimbürg as the man upon whom the electors relied to serve them as their diplomatic representative. It is hardly necessary to state the content of these resolutions as they appear clearly in Gregory Heimbürg's address before the pope. The envoys were introduced to the pope by Aeneas. After the introduction Gregory Heimbürg turned towards the pope and began his address by expressing his appreciation for the privilege accorded him in this interview. He explains that his mission to Rome is in the interest of the peace, the unity, and the tranquility of the Roman church. The prestige, the honor, and the dignity of the Holy Apostolic See are all at stake. He is here in the name of the electors of the Holy Roman Empire, founded by the will of God, and to which the Roman church is closely knit. Growing eloquent he appeals to the Holy Father, the shepherd of the flock, that he, whose concern is for the peace of the church, the bride of Christ, calls for an ecumenical council to be held in one of the six places mentioned, and at a suitable time. He urged the convocation of a council and demanded that the archbishops of Cologne and Trier should be reinstated; upon the issuance of a bull incorporating the resolutions presented, the electors would recognize him as the rightful pope. "Holy Father!" he concluded, "the peace of the Catholic church, the healing of Christian nations, the unity of all believers are given into your hands and depend thereon. With a word you may heal the

²⁶ Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

²⁷ Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

²⁸ Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 90, 91.

wounds of the holy church; it cannot possibly be difficult to do in light of the healing and peace which may result."²⁹

The envoys waited three weeks for the reply of Eugene IV, only to be told that his answer would be sent to the Diet. There was only one course open for Gregory Heimburg. He returned to the Diet to report on his mission and its total failure. In bitter words he assailed the pope and the cardinals for their hostile attitude toward the German people. At the diet the Electoral League finally broke because Aeneas Sylvius paid 2,000 florins to four councilors representing the archbishop of Mainz. The result was that an apparent basis for peace was promised by the papal legate, and the archbishops of Trier and Cologne were deserted by the majority. It is scarcely necessary to state that the end of the German neutrality was the prelude to the complete dissolution of the Council of Basel. In this struggle for the principle of conciliarism Gregory Heimburg played a valiant part, although his, and others', policy of mediation proved more harmful to the conciliar theory and to church reform than he and his contemporaries were able to foresee. Heimburg, like most of his contemporaries that took a mediating position, emphasized the unity of the church and feared any schism. He recognized that conciliarism had failed. He compared the end of the Council of Basel with an oil lamp whose light gradually dies out for lack of oil.³⁰

IV.

Pius II, the former Aeneas Sylvius, decided to continue the prosecution of war against the Turks, which his predecessor Calitux had inaugurated. He proposed a scheme for the raising of funds for his expedition against the enemy that met with much opposition on the part of the German princes, whose envoys to the Congress at Mantua were under the leadership of Gregory Heimburg.³¹

Here at Mantua we also find Sigismund of Austria. He had a grievance against Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa because Pope Nicolas V, in 1450, had conferred upon him a bishopric in direct violation of the Concordat and an imperial agreement.³² Sigismund imprisoned Nicolas of Cusa in April, 1460, and for this crime against a prince of the church, Pius II summoned him to appear before a consistory on August 4, 1460. Sigismund appealed his case to "a better-instructed pope." Gregory Heimburg came to his assistance by issuing an appeal for general publication. He wrote: "We

29 Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, pp. 82, 83.

30 Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

31 This congress opened on June 1, 1459, and lasted until January 19, 1460.

32 The Concordat of Vienna entered into by the pope's legate, Cardinal Carvajal, and Frederick III on February 14, 1448.

appeal, therefore, to a future pope, who may revise the doings of his predecessor; further to a General Council, to be held in accordance with the decrees of Constance and Basel. Nor is this appeal a subterfuge, as we do not wish to avoid the course of natural justice. As the pope has rendered himself notoriously suspected, we will accept any impartial judge whom he may name; we do not refuse his sentence as president of a General Council. If this be denied us, we appeal further to the whole people who love justice and favor innocency. If this be denied us, we call God to witness that it is not our fault that justice is not done, and that we are oppressed."³³ It is interesting to observe how the conciliar theory still dominates his thinking. And it must be observed that he again emphasizes the authority of a general council against the authority of the pope. In another writing, published at this same time, he says,³⁴

A Council, the fostering mother of liberty, the Pope shudders at as though it were an offspring of unlawful passion; by a monstrous decree he condemned it before its birth, and by his condemnation justified. His prohibition showed his fear; his condemnation has given life to what was almost obscured by long silence. He would have been more prudent if he had imitated Solon, who, when asked why he had enacted no special penalty against parricide, answered, "Lest by forbidding I might suggest." Wherefore, prelates of Germany, hold to this point of the Council as the strongest fortress of your freedom. If the Pope succeed in carrying it, he will tax you at his pleasure, will take your money for a crusade, and send it to Ferrante of Naples. For the Pope is fond of bastards; for that reason he calls Heimburg "a child of the devil," because he was born in lawful wedlock. He calls Heimburg also greedy, turbulent, lying. If he strove with blessings, he would be answered; as he strives with curses, he must find another to reply. I am not such a one. My goods are less than my deserts; I have done more work than I have received pay; I have always loved liberty more than flattery. These are no signs of greed. Let the Pope consider his own past and the life he once led.

I leave these personal matters and go back to the Pope's decree. If the whole body of the Apostles was above Peter, a Council is above the Pope. If an appeal can be made to the Pope during a vacancy, it can be made to a Council which is not summoned; for the power of the Church, like the Church itself, never dies. By forbidding such an appeal the Pope treats us like slaves, and wishes to take for his own pleasures all that we and our ancestors have gained by our honest labour. The Pope calls me a chatterer—the Pope, who is himself more talkative than a magpie. I own I have given some attention to the windiness of words, but I have never for that neglected the study of civil and canon law; the Pope has never even smelt at them, but has contented himself with sheer verbosity. I profess myself a member of the lawyer tribe; the Pope is one of those who think that everything can be managed by the force and artifice of a rhetorician. If the Pope excommunicates me for talking, who deserves the penalty more than himself, who has no merit save wordiness? The Pope declares me guilty of treason; he is using a flynet to catch an eagle. He calls me a heretic because I say a Council is above the Pope; I call him a heretic because he says that the Pope is

33 Goldast, *Monarchia*, II, 1587, cited by Creighton, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

34 Creighton, *op. cit.*, pp. 415, 416.

above a Council. He orders my goods to be confiscated; I trust that I live amongst those who count my services as of more value than any gain they could expect from my possessions. He says that they who seize my goods will do a service to the Catholic Church; such a statement would be ridiculous if we had not seen at Mantua the Pope's folly when he, with a flow of words, praised adultery and illegitimacy.

So much for the Pope's charges. Yet all men may appeal from an inferior to a superior tribunal. Like the woman who appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober, I appeal from the Pope angry to the Pope appeased, from the topical orator to the same man when his fit of wind is over, when he has sent away the Muses and has turned to the canon law. In the second place, I appeal to him, if he will bind himself to judge according to the decision of a good man. In the third place, I appeal to any man above suspicion to whom the Pope may choose to delegate the matter. In the fourth place, I submit myself to the judgment of the Pope, if he will remove all cause for suspicion. Finally, if the Pope condemn all these, nothing remains save to appeal to the Universal Church, as men of old appealed from the Senate to the Roman people. Let not the Pope object that the Church is not assembled; that is not my fault, but his.

This address found wide circulation. Pope Pius II excommunicated Sigismund and Gregory Heimburg on Holy Thursday, 1461. Gregory Heimburg found refuge for several years at the court of Bohemia. However, he left Bohemia for Dresden on August 9, 1471. One reason that he, toward the close of his life, sought peace with the church was that some of his confiscated property might be returned to his son Jacob. He petitioned Pope Sixtus VI for absolution, and on December 15, 1471, the pope ordered the archbishop of Messien to instruct the bishop in charge to lift the ban of excommunication. Thursday before Palm Sunday, March 19, 1472, the bishop in Dresden pronounced and made public the absolution. Gregory Heimburg died in August of the same year and was buried in Holy Cross Church in Dresden.³⁵

LIFE AND SALVATION—THE COMMON BASIS FOR JEWS AND GENTILES

E. GOMANN
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

DURANT, in his *Story of Philosophy*, says: "The story of the Jews since the dispersion is one of the epics of European history. Driven from their natural home by the Romans, scattered by flight and trade among all nations and continents, persecuted by Christianity and Mohammedanism—this wonderful people has maintained itself in body and soul. What drama could rival the grandeur of these sufferings?"¹ Portugal and Spain, France

³⁵ Joachimsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 287; Brockhaus, *op. cit.*, p. 383 ff.

¹ Durant, p. 161.

and England, Italy and Russia—all in turn have taken part in the persecution of the Jews. And now the words of Durant are re-written in crucial facts in modern Europe. It is an appalling sight to behold a people being persecuted for the sake of race. And yet this tragedy is not without a blessing. It not only tells us that the time of heroic suffering is not past, but that there is a solidarity among men which resents prejudice and injustice. From the psychological point of view it affords us a deep look into human nature. When man rises against man in hatred and bloody battle, we see clearer than ever the inhumanity of man and the need of a fuller realization of man's common ground and real task.

Inquiring about the common basis for Jews and Gentiles, we must remember first of all that "Jews" and "Gentiles" are Biblical terms. The one goes back to Judah, the son of Jacob, to whom the promises of God in the Old Testament dispensation were transferred. The other is the common Old and New Testament designation for the peoples who surrounded Israel and later on were received into the Christian Church by Paul and the other Apostles. The Old Testament expressions *am* and *gej*, with their New Testament synonyms *laos* and *ethnos*, are used in a general and special sense as people or gentile nations (Jer. 31:9, Eze. 23:30, Ps. 135:15) and as Jews and Christians, chosen people (Deut. 7:6, 4:20, Exod. 15:13, Is. 42:6). The distinction, however, is made entirely on a religious-ethical basis and does not carry with it the idea of racial quality or national superiority. Israel was called out of the nations to be a peculiar and holy people, a "royal priesthood," an *am* by God's free choice and grace. But it lost this distinction and peculiar character when it committed spiritual adultery and forsook the Lord their God, and then degraded to its former status of a nation (*gej*) among other nations, and was so addressed by the Prophets, especially Isaiah (Is. 1:4, 8:9).

The same is true of Christendom. If they were not Jews at the moment of their conversion, they were Gentiles (*ethna*) and only through election by grace became a peculiar and holy people. To this fact the Apostles point when they remind the members of the church that they were formerly darkness.²

It is evident, then, that anthropologically all men are one. "God has made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."³ Made of dust they are pervaded by the spirit of life, breathed into them by their Creator. That makes them a part of the whole creation and tells of their creatureliness. And if Bergson is right in saying that the "elan vital" is like a shell bursting into fragments, then the many races and nations, as well as the various forms of organic and inorganic life, are true to the nature of life as a variety complex.

² Col. 1:13, I Pet. 2:9.

³ Acts 17:26.

What does it matter that in this complexity there are distinct formations of body, divers colors and tongues, higher and lower levels of culture, contradictory views of God and the world? Are not all these, as well as self and sex, the children of life? Does all this variety not rise from the same source and contribute to the same end—"whole-making," as General Smuts would say?⁴ If uniformity and monotony spell death, then "diversity in unity" bespeaks life and breathes creation. The fifteen million Jews living on earth are life-partners with their fellow-Gentiles in Palestine, Russia, France, Portugal, England, and the United States. They have made and will make their contribution to humanity for good or evil.

It shall not be denied that Gentiles have suffered much at the hands of their Jewish fellowmen from the days of Christ and the Apostles to modern times. Twenty million Christians were murdered by communistic Russia in the years 1917-1938.⁵ But on the other page of history we read that the Jewish people have made a wonderful contribution to the spiritual, intellectual, and cultural enrichment of all nations. In fact, Jews have taken their places among the greatest of Gentile philosophers, artists, and scientists. It was Moses Maimonides, the greatest physician of the thirteenth century, who gave us a famous commentary on the Bible, *The Guide to the Perplexed*. It was Baruch Spinoza who taught us a new conception of substance. It was Bergson who led us to look at evolution from the standpoint of spontaneous creation. Heine in Germany, Brandes in Denmark, Disraeli in England, Mendes in France, and many others are well known in the world of letters. And what Mendelssohn, Rubenstein, Mahler, etc., accomplished in the realm of music, that Ehrlich achieved in the field of medicine, Freud in psychology, and Einstein in physics and astronomy.

The Christian Church can never forget how deeply she is indebted to the Jews when she remembers that it is the old noble stock from which Christ and most of the Apostles have sprung. And when we think of such outstanding theologians as Neander, Philippi and Caspari, who were Christians of Jewish birth, we are moved with a sense of grief and shame that the country which gave us these men is today a land in which Jews are persecuted.

It is easy to build up barriers against our fellowmen in our mind, in a nation, and in the world. But to be mindful of them as members of the large human family, and gratefully to acknowledge their contribution to the preservation, ennoblement, and salvation of mankind is to assert life as a harmonious relation of life in obedience to the law and center of life—God.⁶ Receiving and acknowledging the good which individuals of a particular race have done, it is unjust to inflict suffering upon a whole people because

4 Gen. J. Smuts, *Holism and Evolution*.

5 Charles Coughlin, *Persecution, Jewish and Christian*.

6 Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, p. 16.

of wrongs committed by some of its members. Mass persecutions as well as total war are not an indication of a keen sense of justice, but of an abnormal condition in man's mind and in the country. It is a sign that righteousness has gone bankrupt.

However, the real cause for the ghettos, pogroms, and persecutions at various periods of history is not race-prejudice, nationalistic philosophies, and economic conditions. It must rather be sought in a perverse human nature and in a materialistic conception of life. And when we think of such definitions of life as "an integration of matter with a concomitant dissipation of motion" or even such as "a spark," "a stream," etc., we not only feel that they are leading in a wrong direction, but that they are only half-truths. For even biologists and philosophers agree that life has a metaphysical and spiritual side, that there is aim and purpose in it—"a push striving to ever greater risks toward a goal." But human life, intelligent life, is marked by a threefold consciousness of self, of the world, and of God. Life in its fullness is fellowship with God and with men.

At the end of the third chapter of Genesis we read that man was driven out of the Garden of Eden, "lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live for ever." This passage has been interpreted to the effect that the tree of life in the garden had the power to impart immortality. But even if that were so, the life which it gave could never have been life in the real sense; it could at its best only impart life in the physical or ontological sense—a perpetual existence which in the run of ages would prove to be a curse rather than a blessing because of the broken relationship with God. For life in the Biblical sense is a religious-ethical concept. Therefore the "troubles of life" must be traced back to "man's first disobedience and its fruits."

According to God's plan of creation man was to be a living testimony of that vital relationship between the Creator and the creature. And the "calling out" of Israel from all nations had no other purpose than the establishment and introduction of an organ of divine revelation for the salvation of mankind. By the covenant God laid it upon Moses and his people as a solemn obligation to be witnesses of the divine will in a world which had largely departed from its Maker. To testify of God and to foretell His redemption was Israel's foremost mission. And the "burden" of the prophets was their profound feeling that He who has called Israel stands over against him as judge. Therefore the meaningful names used for prophet in Hebrew. He is called "man of God" (*ish elohim*), "man of the Spirit" (*ish ruach*), the "interpreter of the divine will" (*maliz*), "ambassador of the Lord" (*maleak Javeh*). He was regarded as the personified conscience of the people among whom he lived, the champion of God's righteousness, the defender of the poor and down-trodden. Tholuck says prophets were the "living depositories" of the rule of God. And when St. Luke writes, "God spake

by the mouth of his holy prophets," he meant not only Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc., but Abraham, Moses, Samuel, and Elijah are in this succession.

Two factors necessitated the constitution of a special agency of revelation. First, man's mind after the Fall was darkened so that he could no more know God as he should and do His will. God Himself had to provide him with a criterion of truth in matters beyond human knowing, a method to discover facts, things, and relations, doctrines and duties which cannot be discerned by reason or research.⁷ Second, the first sin, consisting in pride, led him on the way to self-glory, and made him unwilling to acknowledge his creatureliness and dependence upon God. The outcome was "vain imaginations."⁸ A study of these passages shows that man had definitely become self- and world-centered. His evaluation of things from the standpoint of the Eternal had ceased. Dethroning God in his heart, he enthroned himself in the world. His own Ego, his culture and nation took the place of the Divine. A re-creation of man and a re-making of history was inevitable to prevent the final doom of humanity. Niebuhr says: "The most obvious meaning of history is that every national culture and civilization brings destruction upon itself by exceeding the bounds of creatureliness, which God has set upon all human enterprises. The prophets discern this fact of judgment most clearly in regard to Israel itself. The first of the great Prophets, Amos, transmits an inchoate Messianic hope into the expectation of doom: The day of the Lord will be darkness and not light."⁹

Aristotle already held that, whatever man accomplished, his highest state is not that of industrial, political, and moral action, but that in which he contemplates the Absolute Being. And here real success does not come by mere experience, ratiocination, and speculation. It does not come the "man way" but the "God way." Philo writes: "If any yearning enters into thee, o Soul, of inheriting the good things of God, thou must leave, not only thy country (that is the body) and thy kindred (sense perception) and the house of thy father (thy reason), but thou must even run away from thyself, go out from thyself, inspired by a kind of prophetic afflatus."¹⁰

General revelation (creation itself, history, dialectics) can only serve as a propaedeutic in regard to the nature of God and the destiny of man. The thoughts which God has about man, the unfolding of His purpose in history, we can learn only from the special revelation of the Old and New Testaments. The note of authority accompanying each statement makes it clear that information here comes from the highest source. Also the manner in which this information is transmitted is significant. As one great divine of the ancient church says, "God never speaks words but acts," so we learn

7 Gordon, *The Science of Revelation*, p. 21.

8 Is. 14:13; 44:14-17, Ps. 2:1, Ps. 14:1, Ps. 49:64.

9 Niebuhr, 137, 140.

10 *Quis Rerum Divinarum Haeres*, 69 f.

from concrete facts and dramatic action that the world has a beginning, and that God, its Creator, is one, holy, just, and merciful Lord; that all men are sinners and are exposed to the wrath of God, except their sins be forgiven; that there is one great High-priest to come who will reconcile men with God, not by virtue of his office but in his own strength and power as the true and living God Himself. Therefore the apostle Paul added to the phraseology, "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," the words God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." This phrase is "the loftiest description that can be given of God." It marks not only the continuity of revelation. But "the apprehension of this ushered in a new day—spring into the gloom of the Roman world. God was in Him; God is like Him, as the "Word become flesh;" God's grace and truth flow to mankind."¹¹

For this reason the church took over the Old Testament as the Word of God and added the New Testament in which Christ and the Apostles speak to mankind in a personal and most perfect revelation. And as Christ is the fulfillment of the Law, and the Prophets, so He is the Lord of the Scriptures. For the church has always regarded herself as the true Israel and heir of the promises of God. It is her firm belief that in Christ the promised Messiah has appeared, who by His death and resurrection has brought about a complete and universal redemption; the fruits thereof being a re-adjustment of man's relationship to God and to his fellowmen. Here, and here alone, is the basis for the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men." In Christ God meets man for the second time in history as the Saviour, as He met him for the first time in the Garden of Eden as the judge.

Mackay rightfully remarks: "To view the crucifixion as a simple historical fact, unrelieved by the glow of any resurrection dawn is to lose one's faith in man and in God. For who were they that compassed the death of Christ? The representatives of religion and culture at their best. The priests of a pure monotheism and soldiers of an international civilization combined, as G. K. Chesterton says, to put Jesus to death. The cross is thus a lasting testimony of the failure of man to recognize the man, a proof of the fact that in mere man there is no hope for the future of the world."¹² It is this significance of the cross which Paul never grew tired of setting before Jews and Gentiles in his Epistles: the Law is fulfilled; God is reconciled with men; we are no more the enemies of God but heirs of everlasting life. "As sin has reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Christ Jesus our Lord."

Formally, with the death and resurrection of Christ the common ground for Jews and Gentiles ceases, but not materially. Revelation still remains

¹¹ Mackay, *Preface to Theology*, 66.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

the foundation on which both stand, only that Christians regard it as complete while the Jews still look for the coming of the Messiah.

The effect of this different understanding of Revelation is, however, manifest in a different method of salvation. With the Jews it is still the Law and works of righteousness, with the Christians it is essentially the grace of God in Christ and faith. It is true that the Jews also know that God is gracious, and that faith is required for salvation, but for them faith is not free from a meritorious character.

A personal and more universal realization of "saving grace" as the fundamental principle of life and salvation is of paramount importance for a better understanding between Jews and Gentiles. It would not only completely change the attitude of Gentiles toward Jews but would make persecutions impossible. In fact, it would serve as a pragmatic test of the truthfulness of Christianity as final revelation and religion of love.

As for the Jews, it is easy to understand how under present tribulations they are little inclined to look favorably upon the Christian faith. But it is not only unfair but unwise to treat it with ridicule and contempt. For a sympathetic understanding and lasting reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles rests on belief in the love of God as revealed in Christ for all mankind.

THE MEDIEVAL PREACHER AND HIS INATTENTIVE CONGREGATION

THEODORE G. TAPPERT
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

THE modern preacher whose congregation is not always attentive may find some comfort in knowing that even in the thirteenth century, commonly known as the age of faith, preaching was not so popular as we are sometimes led to believe. The fact of the matter is that it was in such ill repute that it became necessary for provincial synods to command people to attend Mass and hear sermons on pain of paying heavy fines. Such canons were repeated with monotonous frequency, but they seem not to have been generally heeded. Indeed, their very repetition suggests that they were unavailing.

Priests and monks had little stomach for sermons, and the common people had even less. "How can a preacher persuade the people to come to church and hear sermons," one bishop asked a clerical audience, "when they see that the priests . . . seldom come to hear sermons and are seldom

present at Mass and the rest of the divine service?"¹ Some monks made it a regular practice to absent themselves from their monasteries on Sundays in order gracefully to escape the duty of hearing sermons.² And this practice was imitated, in one form or another, by many of the people. The chancellor of Notre Dame was constrained to reproach the Parisian townspeople for turning their backs on the preacher as soon as they heard him approach, and for leaving the church as soon as they saw him enter the pulpit. "So do the toads when the vine flourishes," he remarked. "The fragrance of the flower annoys them and drives them out, just as the sweetness of God's Word puts these burghers to flight."³ Jacques de Vitry tells of a man who once went to church with the intention of slipping out before the sermon, but who was prevented by a press of people around him. "Being forced to listen to a sermon against his will, and fearing that he might be enchanted like the serpent, he said, 'Would that, by the grace of God, I might escape from this sermon as I have already escaped from a hundred others!'"⁴ Caesarius of Arles is said to have gone so far as to have the church doors shut after the reading of the Gospel to prevent people from leaving before the preacher began. The statute of the Council of Carthage (A. D. 398) was invoked by another preacher: "He who goes out of the assembly in disdain while the priest is delivering his homily in church shall be excommunicated."⁵ The complaints of the preachers were legion. "Some immediately flee when there is preaching," one friar lamented. Another complained that "there are many who respond more promptly to the call of the devil than to the call of God. If the devil calls them, they immediately run to hear his speeches and songs. But if God calls them . . . to a sermon, they immediately flee." Still another preacher asserted that "the jester has more hearers than the preacher."⁶ A Franciscan began one of his sermons with these apologetic words: "You are few indeed; and yet we read that our Lord once preached to just one woman."⁷

Those who went to church and remained for the sermon could be quite as annoying to the preacher as those who stayed away. Some people talked and gossiped, others played chess and diced, and still others concluded business deals while the preacher was in the pulpit. Young people went to

1 J. B. Hauréau, *Notices et Extraits de Quelques Manuscrits Latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1890-93), Vol. III, p. 97.

2 *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 47; Vol. II, p. 288.

3 A. Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire Française au Moyen Âge, spécialement au xiii^e siècle d'après les manuscrits contemporains* (Paris, 1886), p. 215.

4 T. F. Crane, ed., *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry*, in the Folk-Lore Society Publications, Vol. XXVI (London, 1890), pp. xlii-xliii.

5 G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Mediaeval England* (Cambridge, 1926), pp. 180-81.

6 Hauréau, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp. 24, 100.

7 Lecoy de la Marche, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

church to meet their lovers, and students were often present only in body—*vox in choro, mens in foro, vel in mensa vel in thoro*.⁸ Those who went to church directly from their sports or from their work in the fields were “sometimes too overdone merry, and sometimes too overdone sorry and too overdone heavy. . . . Though the tongue pray, the heart prayeth not.”⁹ Whatever the reason, many of the people were inattentive. Their thoughts were elsewhere. The preacher had to make some allowance for this, as Robert de Bourbon did when he began an Easter sermon with the words: “He is risen, he is not here. This is a brief text, and we shall make a brief sermon of it if we can. For I know that today you want a short sermon and a long table.”¹⁰ The most popular preachers recognized that it was necessary to accommodate oneself to one’s congregation. “The greatest prudence and the greatest discernment are necessary in preaching,” Jacques de Vitry wrote in the prologue to his *Sermones Vulgares*. “The same specific is not fit for everyone. The physician who tries to cure all eyes with the same eye-salve is a fool. . . . It is necessary to speak in a different language or idiom at different times. . . .” Alanus de Insulis admonished preachers in a similar vein and indicated that the moods as well as the circumstances of each congregation must be taken into account.¹¹

It seems that one of the commonest moods was indifference. In some instances this was indifference to the preacher’s message alone. “There are many who, when they come to hear a sermon, . . . do not care what the preacher says, but how he says it. And if the sermon is alliterative [*bene rimatus*], if the theme is well divided, if the friar discourses well, if he develops his argument well, and if his sermon is well balanced, they say, ‘How well that friar preaches! What a beautiful sermon he constructs!’ This is the only thing they look for in a sermon. They pay no attention to what the preacher says.”¹² But most of the people who heard sermons were indifferent to their form as well as their content. Such indifference begot boredom, and boredom drowsiness. Unless the people were otherwise preoccupied, they often nodded and went fast asleep. “There are some who have no sooner begun to sing, pray, or read, but they presently begin to slumber: such are wakeful in their beds, but heavy with sleep in the choir. So, too, with the Word of God; they are wakeful enough to hear

8 From a manuscript sermon quoted by C. H. Haskins, “The University of Paris in the Sermons of the Thirteenth Century,” in the *American Historical Review*, Vol. X (1904), pp. 18-19.

9 Early English Text Society *Publications*, Original Series, Vol. CXV, p. 107.

10 Lecoy de la Marche, ed., *Tractatus de diversis materiis prædicalibus d’Etienne de Bourbon* (Paris, 1876), p. 215.

11 *Summa de arte prædicatoria*, in Migne, *Patrologiae, Series Latina*. Vol. CCX, pp. 114-82.

12 Hauréau, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 139.

secular talk, but when the Word of God is set before them, they are soon asleep." What was true of the clergy was not less true of the laity. Some found it easier to fall asleep while leaning against a stone pillar in the church than while lying in their beds at home. "My lord Abbot," one man is reported to have said to the head of a monastery where he had been worshipping, "sell me that stone which lieth by such and such a column in your church, and I will give you whatsoever price you may demand for it." "What?" the abbot said in surprise, "What profit can it be to you?" "I would fain set it by my bed," he answered, "for such is its nature that if a man cannot sleep, and lay his head on that stone, he will slumber forthwith."¹³ Such drowsiness was commonly believed—at the preachers' suggestion, of course—to result from the malicious activity of the devil. The story was told of a good man who once happened upon the devil carrying a sack filled with little boxes of various salves. The devil very obligingly explained to the good man how he used each of the salves; he used one of them, the salve he carried in a black box, to put people to sleep while they were listening to sermons.¹⁴

The preachers of the thirteenth century developed methods to counteract the tendency on the part of their congregations to fall asleep while they were listening to sermons. Some of them startled their auditors into a state of wakefulness. Others introduced stories, as Jacques de Vitry recommended, "especially when the auditors become weary and, affected by tedium, begin to fall asleep. . . . Those who begin to get drowsy with overmuch fatigue are sometimes refreshed by some humorous *exempla* . . . and are afterwards sufficiently awake to listen to serious and helpful words. . . . My own experience may convince you. When I preach a long sermon and see that many of the people are overcome with weariness and are falling asleep, I sometimes stir up everyone and regain their attention with just a simple word or two. For example, I recall having said sometimes: 'That fellow who is sleeping over there won't reveal my secrets and counsel.' Everyone, thinking this was meant for him, opened his eyes. After this interruption the people listened attentively and in silence to the profitable and serious things I had to say."¹⁵ This preacher used a similar device for the same purpose when he interrupted a sermon to say: "Do you want me now to talk to you about worthy womanhood? I'm going to say something instead about that old dame whom I see asleep over there! . . . For God's sake, if anyone has a pin, let him wake her up! Those who sleep at sermon time take good

13 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *The Dialogue of Miracles* (New York, 1929), Vol. I, pp. 233-34; G. G. Coulton, *Life in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1933), Vol. IV, pp. 244-46.

14 M. M. Banks, ed., *An Alphabet of Tales*, in Early English Text Society Publications, Vol. CXXVI, pp. 21-2.

15 Crane, *op. cit.*, pp. xlii-xliii.

care not to sleep at the table!"¹⁶ Caesarius of Heisterbach relates that "I was myself present" when another preacher used the same technique. A number of his listeners "went to sleep, and some even began to snore." Observing that he had lost the attention of his hearers, the preacher cried out: "Listen, brethren, listen! I have something new and important to tell you! There was once a king named Arthur—" There he stopped. Then, after a brief pause, he went on: "You see, my brothers, to what a sad pass we have come. When I was preaching to you about God, you fell asleep; but as soon as I began a secular story, you all woke up and began to listen with eager ears."¹⁷ This method of stirring a slumbering congregation was used to good effect in the thirteenth century, and it has been used, for that matter, ever since.¹⁸

It is a method, however, which easily leads to abuse. And such abuse was not wanting in the thirteenth century. The people were so eager to hear amusing stories that the preacher was tempted to amuse rather than edify them. Dante had this in mind when he referred to the fact that

E'en they whose office is
To preach the Gospel, let the Gospel sleep,
And pass their own inventions off instead. . . .
The preacher now provides himself with store
Of jests and jibes; and so there be no lack
Of laughter; while he vents them, his big cowl
Distends, and he has won the meed he sought.¹⁹

Preachers quickly discovered that the easiest way to revive the attention of people who were dropping off to sleep was to tell some salty tale about the wickedness of a priest or monk or nun. Attempts were made to curb this growing practice. Preachers were advised to refrain from repeating stories which "will be a scandal to the religious and will not be very edifying to the people." Moreover, when they related stories that were otherwise inoffensive, they were urged to avoid coarse language and suggestive ex-

16 Lecoy de la Marche, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

17 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 233.

18 Even so sober a preacher as Samuel J. Mills, Sr., is said to have resorted to this method in his Connecticut congregation early in the nineteenth century. It was a hot, sultry summer day, and the children in the gallery were growing restless while their elders were becoming drowsy down below. Addressing the boys in the gallery, Mr. Mills interrupted his sermon to say: "Boys, you must make less noise in the gallery; if you don't, you will wake up your fathers downstairs!"—T. C. Richards, *Samuel J. Mills* (Boston, 1906), p. 8.

19 *Paradiso*, Canto XXIX, lines 99 ff. (Cary's translation). Cf. Hauréau, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp. 24-25; Lecoy de la Marche, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

pressions.²⁰ But these admonitions were of little avail. With some notable exceptions, preachers continued to regale the people with what Erasmus later called "old wives' tales and frivolous topics." Handbooks of sermon illustrations, which contained many tales of this kind, were prepared. Preachers often used the illustrations without treating the doctrine or the moral which they were intended to illumine. They kept the people awake by relating a series of stories for the sake of the stories themselves. The preparation of sermons was thus made relatively simple. Provided with countless anecdotes, the preacher could take his ease and sleep without a care (*Dormi secure* was the appropriate title of one of the later handbooks for preachers) "for this reason that without much study they [the anecdotes] may be appropriated and preached to the people."

20 A. G. Little, ed., *Liber Exemplorum ad Usum Praedicatorum*, in the *Studies* of the British Franciscan Society (Aberdeen, 1908), Vol. I, pp. 93, 95, 98, 115, 120, etc. With reference to one such story the preacher is significantly advised: "Nec expedit de religiosis talia populo pronunciare. . . . Si autem praedicatur religiosis, tota narracia . . . utilis erit" (pp. 94-95). Equally significant is the inclusion, without such comment, of a story about a man who "propriam agnoscens uxorem ita eidem sicut canis inhesit, ut ad tempus ab ea nullatenus divelli posset," etc. (p. 70).

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS¹

Faith and Nurture. By H. Sheldon Smith. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. xii, 208 pages. \$2.

The modern movement in Protestant religious education is confronted with a crucial decision in its theological orientation. "Shall Protestant culture realign its theological foundations with the newer currents of Christian thought or shall it resist those currents and merely reaffirm its faith in traditional liberalism?" (p. vii). To appreciate the author's proposals in answering this question it is necessary first of all to identify his conception of the significant marks of traditional liberalism.

In tracing the development of theological liberalism during the latter half of the nineteenth century, four tendencies emerge to mold decisively the underlying theological thought of Christian culture in the twentieth century. In a large measure, these tendencies were reactions to their antitheses in the then predominant theological thought.

1) *Divine immanence.* The idea of a transcendent God, in its effort to emphasize sovereignty, had tended to deny or to obscure the fact of God's indwelling presence. Traditional liberalism in a variety of forms so magnified the concept of unified and dynamic order as to deny or obscure a supernatural idea of God. In many instances, the result was an identification of God and His operations with the processes of natural law.

2) *Growth.* The roots of this reaction are to be found in an opposition to a conception of life wherein progress was brought about primarily through revolutionary and catastrophic change. The interpretation of past events and the approach to current problems accordingly had to find their point of departure in a philosophy of continuous development. This philosophy came to have a threefold application: growth of religion in the individual; growth of religion in the race; and growth as a mode of achieving individual and social change.

3) *The goodness of man.* Since the idea of human depravity was regarded offensive, traditional liberals moved to the opposite extreme in their contention for the goodness of man. They held, as a presupposition of theology and nurture, that nothing more was needed than to permit man to grow godlike by the gradual unfolding of his own inner nature.

4) *The historical Jesus.* The emphasis on the divine nature of Jesus had tended to nullify His humanity. The reaction to this resulted in an emphasis upon His humanity with only secondary attention to any relation He might have with God. Too frequently, a generalization of the qualities embodied in Jesus came to be divorced from Him as a person. This had its inevitable effect upon courses and procedures in religious education.

Having set forth and critically valued these marks of liberal faith, Dr. Smith proceeds to point out weaknesses in the Social Gospel idea of the Kingdom of God. His valuation is concerned with the Kingdom as the "Democracy of God," its anthropocentric or theocentric nature, its presence upon earth, and the process whereby it shall come. This gives rise to a study of man as a creature of God, the basis for human value, man's relations to the community, and man as a sinner.

¹ Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be secured through the United Lutheran Publication House, 1228 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Having indicated that the current conceptions of the Kingdom and of man stand in need of revision, attention is focused upon the nature of the Christian Gospel. The author contends that liberal Protestant nurture is feeble because it is rooted in a sub-Christian Gospel. "The idea of revelation in the sense that in Jesus Christ God disclosed the ultimate meaning of existence is quite foreign to the thought of most liberal educators, and especially to those who belong to the 'progressive' wing of religious nurture" (p. 106). With the strong emphasis upon processes of thought there is a proportionate neglect of the object of thought—a disparaging of historical values, including those of the Bible. The Gospel of repentance and deliverance is paled into insignificance.

The concluding chapters deal with the church as the community of Christian nurture and the place of religious faith in the democratic school. The church is the community of the divine initiative and of the ultimate fulfillment of life. Its center is one Lord, Jesus Christ, and thus it becomes the community of divine mediation. Facing an increasing demand to include religious instruction in the public schools, the church must decide what the nature of this instruction ought to be—the religion of the churches or the religion of humanistic experimentalism.

Faith and Nurture may give the impression of pursuing too extensively a negative treatment. The author justifies his negative emphasis on the grounds that past efforts to find a way forward in Christian thinking have been characterized, at least in their earlier phases, less by constructive achievement than by critical reconsideration. While stimulus to such critical reconsideration is provided, the merit of the book does not stop there. Accompanying his unhesitating criticism of that which he considers weak or false are clear statements of positive conviction and of constructive procedures.

The worth of this book to the individual reader will depend in large part upon the mind with which he approaches it. The *traditional liberalist* may understand Dr. Smith to be calling for a return to the rigid orthodoxy of an uncritical day and, in his rebellion, receive no profit from the criticisms offered. With such a frame of mind, he would do the work an injustice. However, if he reads with sympathy and objectivity, he will be prompted to scrutinize once more the ground whereon he stands. The *traditional orthodoxist* may look upon Dr. Smith as a "defender of the faith," a protagonist of uncritical, dogmatic teaching. If his reading of the book leaves him fortified in his self-complacency, he has not seen the point of the author's attack. Realizing that the work is not directed to the solution of his difficulties, he ought nevertheless to be led to an emphasis upon essential values in Christianity. He could find real profit in weighing some of the contributions made by the traditional liberalists. The *traditional ecclesiastic* may find justification for his opposition to an organized educational program in the church. Should this be the case, he would do well to reread the book, especially the statement which appears on page 103. "The inference to be drawn from this fact is not that the church should renounce the function of Christian nurture. On the contrary, to the fullest possible extent the church should share its life and faith with the young. This is a basic and continuing task of the church. Nevertheless, the church must not surrender to the illusion that child-nurture, in itself, will rekindle the fire of life and faith in the Christian community. . . . Unless the faith comes alive in the soul of some mature individual or group religious vitality may be expected to continue to decline in modern culture."

O. FREDERICK NOLDE

God's Back Pasture. By Arthur Wentworth Hewitt. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1941. 144 pages. \$1.50.

Those who have read Dr. Hewitt's so well received *Highland Shepherds* will not be influenced by any review but will secure a copy of his new book regardless of praise or criticism. For others it may be stated that *God's Back Pasture* is but a continuation of the previous work. It is written, so the preface indicates, to satisfy the only known flaw in the former book, that of having passed by the field of sociology. To please these critics, Dr. Hewitt has written again. But whether they will all be pleased is another question. Looked at from the sociologist's point of view, he is rather undogmatic and exhibits tendencies to which the straight-laced academician can not consent. "Where I may fail," the writer says in the preface, "my apology is that I know no better, but whether the script is true in all places to your experience or not, at least it comes out of my own." The tenor of the book may be gathered from the opening lines, "Any bird's-eye view of the rural parish will depend on the bird which views it."

Mr. Hewitt is no respecter of persons. He is not greatly influenced, as far as these pages reveal, by what the Fathers may have thought or taught. Quoting passages from Bishop Matthew Simpson's Yale lectures on preaching, he does it "for their utterly debased ideals" (in regard to a minister's public relations) and thinks of the bishop's implication to be "an insult." "If the bishop knew," he concludes this soliloquy, "what I am thinking just now, he would whirr in his grave so that you could cut logs with his buzz-saw bones."

The scientist's hunger for exact terminology is not appreciated by the author. "Now," he reasons, "if you have a rural heart and background we can have our talk out, and it will be best not to tie our tongues with too much definition, for there is infinite variety on God's back pasture." Dr. Hewitt is not swayed, as we have seen, by either present or past authorities if they fail to meet his standards. And if for a moment you should be under the impression that he is bearding only dead lions among the ecclesiastics, do not be mistaken. So outspoken is he in his condemnation of present-day religious leadership (except that which sees eye to eye with him), that this reviewer hesitates to quote further samples from the doctor's pointed pen bearing on the subject. His chapter on "The Dismal Diagnosis" will delight the professional ruralite, but denominational administrators whom the shoe might fit may resent some of his statements. Former rural pastors, now serving in the city, will consider his references to them unfair; and for some young men this side of ordination their fondest urban or metropolitan dreams will be blasted.

Non-rural parsons who are open for suggestions and are getting short on sins to confess before their Lord will find in these pages a potent stimulus for repentance in sackcloth and ashes. What Hewitt has to say about the country church as the victim of church dignitaries' "invincible ignorance," of "ecclesiastical manslaughter" and "pious immorality," brings gooseflesh even to those whose sins may lie in a different direction. The very sponsors of his literary output are not spared some dressing down. He writes as he pleases. He asks no quarter and gives none. In producing the book he thought of the cause for which he wrote; nothing else mattered. Few writers in the religious field will dip their pens in vinegar and chloride as the author does, though scores of others share his sentiments. Concerning bishops he reasons, "by their plums ye shall know them." As to "ecclesiastical manslaughter," he offers this explanation for the choice of such gentle term: "I spare the word 'murder,' for that implies intentional guilt, and country churches are killed with the best spirit in the world. Yet often they are killed by those whose chief duty is to care for them." Hewitt's independence must be a thorn in the flesh of his superiors.

Having been a member of the Vermont legislature and for many years chairman of the state board of education, in addition to his being greatly in demand as lecturer on rural subjects in several states, the author is not handicapped by any provincialism. From such vantage point he feels free to scrutinize the doings of the church's leadership and their attitude toward his (or any one else's) beloved Highland. It must be left to the reader to judge who comes out on top in the mental struggle. Out of respect to his betters this reviewer, a ruralite himself, severely refrains from cheering his team.

Here are some of the subjects he deals with, divided into analytical and directional thoughts, "The rural parish and what is wrong with it," "the house of God," small church economics, the rural pastor as civic leader, social and community organizations, and the larger parish. The writer's background as a schoolman is shown in an especially strong section on the rural pastor as educator. Under "Hy Heart's in the Highlands" you find a basic treatment of "Rural Philosophy" and a selection of prayers by rural men. The value of the 144-page book is greatly increased by an ample cross-reference index, a feature so often neglected by preacher-writers.

What may *God's Back Pasture* mean to you? For rural pastors it will prove an invigorating tonic. The man in the city may be led to a new appreciation of the work of obscure and unknown country parsons who year-in and year-out train boys and girls only to lose them to the city church toward which the rural overflow gravitates. Church dignitaries may want to investigate the justification of Mr. Hewitt's charges against them and counteract with truth in their own possession. Students for the ministry are categorically pressed to make a choice of but one of two glories that await the consecrated man in the church militant; it is either work in the man-made city or out in God's country.

In a straightforward manner which but few can employ, Dr. Hewitt has stated the country church's case, vastly enriching its literature. Here are grapes of wrath in a nutshell.

MARTIN SCHROEDER

Jesus in Action. By Benjamin W. Robinson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. ix, 217 pages. \$1.50.

Professor Robinson has now added to his widely used books on *The Life of Paul* and *The Gospel of John* a third volume of equal excellence dealing with the life and teaching of Jesus. Its purpose is "to linger a while with Jesus, to converse with him, to become acquainted with his healthy spirit." The Jesus with whom the reader will converse in this book is "a highly positive personality" who "was invariably animated by an affirmative forthgoing power" (p. 21).

Part I is a study of "the positive personality" of Jesus, His personal qualities, His assertion of leadership, and His aggressive methods of work.

Part II, "the positive program," presents the evidence from the Gospels and draws the conclusion that Jesus had a definite plan of campaign for His life, including the cross, which He viewed as "a practical means of turning the material into the spiritual." Thus viewed, Jesus' suffering "becomes part of an aggressive movement and appears not as something inflicted upon him but as an act in his campaign of love for men" (p. 75). Jesus took up His cross as "a critically necessary element in building up a spiritual society" and with great firmness He required His followers to do likewise.

In Part III the author discusses Jesus' "positive use of previous religion"—His dynamic attitude towards truth (illustrated by contrast with Socrates and the

Buddha), His use of the Mosaic Law, and His application to Himself of the latter part of Isaiah and the books of Jonah and Daniel, three books which He loved especially.

Part IV exhibits "the positive teaching" of Jesus on the nature of the human soul, and affirmative goodness as over against the negativeness of moral evil. It concludes with a study of typical examples to illustrate the aggressive, affirmative character of Jesus' words and deeds.

Back of this volume lies a life-long study of the literary and the historical problems with which one who writes about Jesus has to deal. But the author's purpose is not to discuss these problems here. In his Preface he says: "Jesus is the center of our interest. This does not mean that every saying quoted was necessarily spoken by Jesus personally. Often statements and sayings of his followers are quoted when they show the spirit of his life and message. It is the gospel which went out from Jesus to save the world which is our subject of study."

From beginning to end Jesus is presented as the aggressive master of His life. He knew how to assert His claims and yet how to be meek. His temptations were tests, "not for a break-down but—a break-down being recognized as impossible—for some deflection from the straight and higher path of a Son of God" (p. 18). His prayer, "Thy will be done," was not passive, fatalistic resignation, but an active, aggressive doing of God's will. His entire passion was a series of affirmative acts of His own. "Jesus in fact conducts the events of His own passion. He knows beforehand the things that are coming upon Him" (p. 66).

It is at this point that the reader will need to keep in mind what the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews has to say about the nature of Jesus' temptations and the significance of Jesus' death (Heb. 2:9-18, 4:14-16, 5:7-10). For if Professor Robinson's thesis is pressed too far, the temptations of Jesus become unreal to us, since it is hard to see how he could have been "in all points tempted like as we are," if he had not felt the temptations that are common to all, and if the outcome of his temptations had been a foregone conclusion. Likewise, if Jesus walked the way to Calvary *knowing* the outcome on Easter without having to take that outcome on faith, he could not have "tasted" death for other men who are deprived of such knowledge. Again, while it is true that Jesus' emphasis in prayer is "not on the patience that endures but on the energy that does not faint" (p. 144), there are times when the soul does faint, moments of weakness which compel men to recognize that the very energy with which they are to continue to pray must be supplied by God's grace at work within the soul (Rom. 8:26-27). Jesus did pray "with strong crying and tears" (Heb. 4:7), but if he was to be fully qualified to sympathize with men, He too must have had such moments of weakness.

On the other hand, much of our current Christian thinking, in its anxiety to avoid what it stigmatizes as activism, falls into the greater risk of overemphasizing the passive and receptive element of the Christian experience. Here is where Dr. Robinson's book furnishes a much needed corrective. He points out that, while membership in the Kingdom of God is indeed a free gift, "the nature of the message is such that it can really be received only by the most energetic grasping of it" (p. 145). And since the Kingdom of God is divine love in action upon mankind, goodness, in Jesus' view of it, was never a merely receptive characteristic, but always expressive and productive as well. The very meekness and humility of the Beatitudes became a campaigning quality. "It is as if Jesus had said, 'Gird on your weapons of love and faith and assail your man with all your might. The evil man has played the aggressor. Do you likewise. But let your aggressiveness be the aggressiveness of beneficence.' If this is the right reading of Jesus we must travel far beyond a mere doctrine of passive non-resistance in order to reach it" (p. 164). Jesus saw no value in isolated pain or

self-denial. "Spiritual 'rest' is not for Jesus a passive quality. It does not come by making slaughter in the streets of Mansoul. . . . The peace which Jesus gives is peace by empowerment, the vital peace of the elm tree whose high-arched branches rest upon the summer air, not the peace of the tree-timber which is trodden under foot" (pp. 162-3).

Enough has been quoted to show how passage after passage in the New Testament is made to glow with positive meaning. The most striking illustration of Professor Robinson's style and point of view is seen in what he has to say about the Lord's Supper. Speaking of the wine, he says, "There could scarcely be a more emphatic symbol or representation of the positive, affirmative, and life-giving quality of his life and death. He gave his life as a force which went into others and made them alive. It was not exactly or merely a shedding of blood. It was *blood transfusion*" (pp. 182-83).

RAYMOND T. STAMM

The Nature of the Early Church. By Ernest F. Scott. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. 245 pages. \$2.

Dr. Scott can look back upon a long and distinguished career as one of our best-known New Testament scholars and the author of many publications in the field of New Testament scholarship. His latest book on the nature of the early church is the ripe fruit of his life-long studies and a valuable contribution to the literature on the subject. However, it is not a strictly historical inquiry, but it has a practical aim, and it is written in that attractive and persuasive style which makes its appeal to a much larger class of readers than the comparatively small circle of professional scholars and students. Moreover, the book comes at a time when the question of the church, its unique character, its mission, and its place in human life and society, has risen into new prominence in the midst of the confusion and chaos of present world conditions. The minds of thoughtful men everywhere are beginning to turn again into the direction of the church for light and guidance.

But what is the church? What is the fundamental idea that lies at the heart of it? Has the church an answer to the thousand and one questions which men looking for spiritual guidance are asking in these days of perplexity? And what is that answer? What is the light by which the church can guide the steps of men? Questions of this kind will come to the reader of this book and they have been in the author's own mind.

Dr. Scott's book is not bound up with any particular "doctrine" or dogmatic theory of the church. Its aim is to create a better understanding of the church's present mission by going back to the formative period of the church at the time of the New Testament. Dr. Scott is convinced that all the vital questions with which we are confronted today when we think of the church and its mission, can be solved in the light of that crucial period of which the New Testament bears witness—that period when the church first came into being and had to accommodate itself to the world.

This conviction is explained by the author in the first chapter on the Significance of the Primitive Church, and he comes back to it in the last chapter. But it involves an interpretation of the historical facts presented in the New Testament which will not be accepted except by those who agree with the author's fundamental idea that the church of the New Testament is a compromise between the message of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God and the task by which His disciples were confronted after His death.

The church had its origin in the message of the Kingdom proclaimed by Jesus Himself. When Jesus departed, His disciples looked for His immediate return to establish His Kingdom on earth. When this hope was not fulfilled the church gradually changed its character: it had to acclimatize itself in this world. "The church arose out of the message of Jesus. But it may also be said to have arisen out of the apparent failure of the message. Jesus had proclaimed the Kingdom and had created a brotherhood which should live for it and inherit it when it came. But it did not come, and the brotherhood which waited for it had to maintain itself in the present world. Unless it could be fitted somehow into the earthly scheme of things, it could not hope to survive and fulfill its divine calling. In all times since the church has had these two aspects."

By changing its character, Dr. Scott believes, the church has undoubtedly lost something of its early enthusiasm and dynamic power. But it has also gained something, and everything considered, the gains will perhaps outweigh the losses. At any rate, the change had to come, and when it came, when the church adapted its message to the present order of things, it was perhaps the only way in which the Gospel of the Kingdom with its absolute claims upon us could be made intelligible to the great mass of ordinary Christians: "Popular Christianity has always been a compromise, and perhaps it is only in this form that the gospel teaching can ever be made intelligible." Nevertheless, the true function of the church still consists in bearing witness for the Kingdom of God. In the midst of the earthly order it asserts the fact of a spiritual order, and makes it a reality in the minds of men." This is the light by which it can guide the steps of men today.

Dr. Scott has divided his book into ten chapters which deal with almost every aspect of New Testament Christianity: the significance of the primitive church, the church and the message of Jesus, the initial period, worship in the early church, the organizing of the church, teaching in the early church, Paul's conception of the church, the ethical task of the church, the church and the state, conclusion with a selected bibliography. In every chapter the reader will find many illuminating passages. But the discussion as a whole lays itself open to two most serious criticisms. In the first place, the main thesis upon which the discussion is based identifies Jesus with the apocalyptic ideas of His time and makes Him responsible for the dilemma in which the disciples found themselves after His death. In the next place, there is little room in Dr. Scott's interpretation of the New Testament facts for the redemptive work of Christ, His atoning death and resurrection, which are the very heart and center of the apostolic *kerygma*, the Christian message of salvation, with which the positive Christian faith and the faith of the church at all times are inseparably bound up.

H. OFFERMANN

What Mean These Stones? Millar Burrows, American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, 1941. 306 pages. \$2.50.

Here is a volume to put beside the works of Albright, Barton, and Kenyon in the field of Biblical Archaeology. Its purpose and content are well defined by the subtitle: "The significance of Archaeology for Biblical Studies."

The dangers of attempting to vindicate or disprove the revelation of Scripture by archaeological evidence are noted in the first chapter, along with a clear description of the domain of archaeology and its methods—both explorative and interpretative. The second chapter concerns the literary and linguistic evidence which supplements and abets the findings and interpretations of the archaeologist. Likewise it is noted

that archaeology has helped improve our knowledge of Biblical text and languages. In general it is said that archaeology testifies to the broad reliability of the literary remains of antiquity.

The third chapter gives a summary of the topography and history of Bible lands as they are reconstructed by the archaeologist. The bearing of archaeology upon the life and religion of the ancient peoples is developed in the fourth and fifth chapters. The evolution of houses, tools, and so forth is sketched in bold broad outlines. Naturally the importance of pottery is stressed. The religion of Palestine is discussed from the viewpoint of archaeological remains. It is emphasized that religious beliefs cannot be reconstructed from the evidence of the spade alone. But in general the outstanding service to Biblical studies contributed by archaeology is a better understanding of ancient life as the whole background of Biblical history, literature, and religion. In the final chapter specific instances are described and evaluated, by way of illustration, of the type of results to be expected from archaeology. Difficulties of text, deficiencies of historical record, and other problems are noted as being illuminated by archaeology. The limitation of archaeology is well expressed thus: "Archaeology can tell us a great deal about the topography of a military campaign. It can tell us nothing about the nature of God" (p. 290).

Both Old and New Testament periods and literature are discussed in this book. It is in no wise the exclusive property of the Old Testament student, but will prove a valuable tool for all Biblical students. The illustrations and index do not lessen the value of this fine publication.

CARL UMHAU WOLF

Introduction to the Old Testament. By Robert H. Pfeiffer. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941. xiii, 917 pages. \$4.

The writing of a first-class introduction to the Old Testament is one of the most exacting tasks a scholar can set for himself. Never was this more true than today when nearly every learned journal contains news of discoveries bearing directly or indirectly on some phase of Old Testament study.

Professor Pfeiffer's book is literally a mine of information. Each book of the Old Testament is treated separately and adequately. But that is not all. There is a lengthy discussion of the canon, text, formation, and literary interest of the Old Testament. Of especial value is the chapter on "Religious interest in the Old Testament." Few are the scholars who will not find much that is new to them. The bibliographies are complete and up-to-date.

It is impossible, in the scope of a brief review, to say all that should be said of the book. However, a few observations are in order. The author's point of view is moderately critical and represents definitively the higher critical position. It is highly probable that some modification will have to be made presently, as may be seen, for example, in the reviews by Rolland E. Wolfe of Rudolph's *Der Elohist von Exodus bis Josua* and von Rad's *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs* (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LX, pp. 417-24). Very discerning is the discussion of transmission of the text of the Old Testament; so also that of the versions. The analysis of the documents of the Pentateuch is enlightening, though one may not fully agree with it. The characterization of the sources is excellent and will serve the student well.

The study of the prophets is quite stimulating. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel have a long section devoted to them. Everything written upon them has been combed and the essence thereof set down for the reader. Some sections of the Hagiographa

might have been improved by the consideration of recent archaeological material. Then, too, one might disagree with the author's dates of Ruth, Chronicles, and Psalms. But these are all minor matters that pale into insignificance before the magnitude of the work as a whole.

Certainly this will be the standard Old Testament introduction in English until archaeological and epigraphical material can more confidently be brought to bear on the problems of the Old Testament. Ras Shamra, Mari, and Nuzi will revolutionize Old Testament study. No student or pastor really in love with his Bible can afford to do without Pfeiffer's book.

J. M. MYERS

The Old Testament Problem. By A. Noordtzy. Translated from the Dutch by Miner B. Stearns. Dallas: Seminary Book Room, 1941. 60 pages. 35 cents.

This paper bound booklet is a reprint from three numbers of *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1940-41, now published by the Dallas Theological Seminary, an Evangelical institution. The original pagination of the periodical is unfortunately retained without a numbering suitable to the separate publication.

The translator's interest seems to be apologetic, but former pupils of the late Professor Benze, at Mount Airy, may recall his use of Noordtzy's original address as long ago as 1930 in lectures giving historical treatment of Pentateuchal criticism. For Lutherans, criticism has a proper place within the bounds of historical, as subordinate and preliminary to theological, interpretation of the Word of God. The Wellhausen school needs, therefore, less of polemical than of sympathetic, historical attention to put it in its place. In effect, this is what Noordtzy's address in 1927 largely helped to accomplish. It is a useful summary of nineteenth century Biblical criticism and an introduction to twentieth century points of view, at least in so far as it represents the work and views of continental European scholarship. To have this in English dress is of distinct advantage.

CHARLES M. COOPER

Now We Must Choose. By Henry Nelson Wieman. New York: Macmillan Company, 1941. 245 pages. \$2.

The reviewer has never encountered a more deceptive volume than this little grey book. Its format is charming, and from all appearances it is just the kind of book which invites attention for a quiet evening or two; wherein is the reader misled. *Now We Must Choose* is a concise encyclopaedia of the anatomy of democracy—and things in general! An adequate review would be to this book as *Midrash* is to *Torah*. The incisive mind, which, with breathtaking results, explored prayer and mysticism in the earlier *Methods of Private Religious Living* has an analytic field-day in the contemporary world. This professor of the philosophy of religion at the University of Chicago made the head of one Lutheran pastor spin like a wobbling top through the reading of 245 harmless-appearing pages. As a contribution to homiletic material, even with the index, *Now We Must Choose* is far down at the place where ideas begin.

Midway in his volume the author tosses a trite observation, "In general it may be said that what is closest to our living is farthest from our understanding. The most important things are so intimately involved in all our doings and other experiencing that it is difficult to get them clearly before us." By the time the reader has reached page 139 this comment has no platitudinous connotation. The

author already has sustained his interpretation of democracy's "lost dynamic" by examining "the most important things." The first pages chart the course; Wieman recalls the common answer to the cause of the democracies' fall before the dictators in that while the former shrank from war the latter sought war and prepared for it. "But as we look at the actual sequence of events, it becomes as plain as Hitler's forelock that the weakness of the democracies did not spring from this. It sprang from the lack of a unifying drive which could mark out a course of action straight and wide and deep, down which the massive might of democratic peoples could pour with purpose clear and sure. . . . There was blocking within, one interest struggling against another."

Here, then, is the choice which confronts us: a *dictator* or a *faith* creating community out of diversity. It is not comforting to be made aware of the implications of this choice since December 7. Professor Wieman is no pacifist but the reviewer suspects that the democracy which he would fight to keep is a possibility made profoundly more difficult of achievement by the present conflict. Conflict may be creative of democracy and of the faith upon which democracy must feed, but here is the evaluation of the author, "Now, as long as each fights simply to preserve his own situation intact so far as possible without regard for anything else, the conflict is destructive." It is not likely that those in high places who must support a successful war effort in the immediate situation will be zealous for bringing about the acceptance or establishment of a democratic socio-political method similar to the "social-unit plan" approved by the author. Yet, despite intentions, a lengthy, exhausting conflict may enforce such a pattern.

The serious reading of *Now We Must Choose* will be a realistic, bracing tonic for those who find it necessary to define the possibilities resident in the American tradition which are worth defending by war. Particularly interesting are the two closing chapters, "Genius of the People" and "A Faith for Democracy." The first of these is a penetrating indictment of "the individualists" and a lyric appreciation of "the people." The theory and practice of our democracy have been founded on release of the individual; that must continue, but only in subjection to the needs of the people, basically limited by reference to their needs. Professor Wieman is neither an economic nor a political conservative! Just how, in wartime, the community of the people will be freed of its evil and of all its bad habits "gently, with loving care lest the gift of the people be impaired" is not indicated by the author. Yes, God has an important place in the scheme of things proposed in *Now We Must Choose*, but Wieman's "divine Source of all Value" may not be recognized by all as identical with God as evangelical faith has known Him.

L. RALPH TABOR

Ethics and Social Policy. By Wayne A. R. Leys. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1941. 522 pages. \$4.

The appearance of a new comprehensive and up-to-date text in ethics is an event which has been keenly awaited by many of us, especially by those who have had to teach college classes in this subject and have felt the need of a satisfactory textbook. The anticipation is heightened when the new book makes its appearance in the Prentice-Hall Philosophy Series which most recently filled another need with such a solid contribution as Brightman's *Philosophy of Religion*.

Much can be said in favor of Leys's book. It approaches the problems of ethics in terms of living social issues instead of time-honored but often threadbare controversies of the past. Most of what is permanently valuable in the traditional discussions is intro-

duced in the course of the presentation, but the method uniformly followed is to begin with a current problem, to develop its rational and social implications, and to encourage the reader to think out its ultimate inferences. It is a wide-range application to practical philosophy of the pedagogical technique usually described as "life-situation" or "problem-solving" method. Instead of abstract expositions of "the right," "the good," or "free will," the introduction to ethics is through such problems as capital and labor, unemployment insurance, marriage and divorce, dictatorship and democracy, and socialized medicine. Since the author looks upon ethics as a critical discipline, a "criticism of thoughtless evaluations," he is satisfied with being a Socratic gadfly, disturbing any easy-going acceptance of ready-made solutions and stinging his readers to a search for a rational philosophy of life. His avowed purpose is to present not what to believe but how to think. But he has also gathered a wealth of factual information and he relates most of his factual data to value judgments with fine analytical skill and discriminating judgment. This is particularly evident in his treatment of the complicated economic problems of the day. The exercises at the end of each chapter, the most excellent feature of the book, reveal not only a breadth of information coupled with thoroughness and originality, but also a rare mastery of the art of teaching philosophy. Comprehensive in content, scholarly in form, and yet fascinating in style, this book represents a vast amount of persevering and alert intellectual labor by a competent workman.

Having said all this, it may seem paradoxical to say also: This book does not measure up to the expectations aroused. For all its informativeness it arrives practically nowhere. The reader who expects a moral philosopher to make a clear statement and an intelligent defense of his life-convictions will be disappointed. And he will have a growing feeling that the reason for leaving one issue after another "up in the air" is not simply the pedagogical one of stimulating the reader's own thinking. Underneath is the author's own relativism which deals so exclusively with premises and means that it has little to say about conclusions and ends. Like pragmatism in education, this kind of ethics "knows more and more about less and less."

The author's basic difficulty stems from his desire to make the scientific spirit of critical investigation serve as the guide of life. In this respect he lags behind the scientific thinkers themselves who are beginning to realize that science cannot bear such a strain. As Philip Frank asserted in the first Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion, "Scientific thinking by itself cannot set men any goal either in private or political life. It must, then, be the task of religion . . . to do what science is unable to do." Leys's outstanding weakness lies precisely here. It is the superficiality and flippancy of his attitude toward religion. He speaks for "modern persons who hold their theological tenets in a fairly light and academic manner" (p. 392). To him the Kingdom of God is among the ideals of yesterday (p. 73). In his opinion, the beliefs of the early Christians were grounded in "the feelings of insecurity which characterize prescientific men" (p. 393). Hence his principal discussion of religion is in a chapter on "ancient intolerance" dealing with values which "inquiry and discussion jeopardize" (p. 457). He quotes Paul and Luther only as examples of intolerant anti-intellectualism. And he goes out of his way to present naive criticisms of the Bible (p. 26), quite unaware of anything that modern critical exegesis might have to say on these matters. Drawing his interpretation of religion from such shoddy sources as Harry Elmer Barnes' *Twilight of Christianity*, he has nothing to say about the positive moral significance of intelligent religion. He typifies that secularistic mentality to which Mortimer Adler referred in saying, "Democracy has much more to fear from the mentality of its teachers than from the nihilism of Hitler."

All teachers of ethics should become acquainted with this book because of its methodological value. No honest teacher in a church-related school and no other

teacher with a sound religious consciousness will place it in the hands of immature students as a text. This rejection, based chiefly upon the author's thoughtless treatment of religion, is quite ethical as judged by his own conception of ethics: "criticism of thoughtless evaluations." A careful reading of this book leaves the reviewer this inescapable conviction: There is an urgent need for a text in ethics using the external technique of the present work but written with a clear understanding of the spirit of evangelical Christianity. Such a text would agree with Leys that we have no ready-made code to apply to our moral problems, but, unlike him, it would see in Christ more than a law-giver and in Christianity more than the Golden Rule. It would know how to distinguish between the Law and the Gospel and it would present in terms of modern thinking the goal and the power for personality-building for which the Kingdom of God stands.

T. A. KANTONEN

The Christian Attitude Toward War. By Loraine Boettner. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940. 120 pages. \$1.

The people of the world have been thinking war for a long time. Many books have been written on the subjects of war and peace. The present crisis calls for serious and sober re-thinking and the sharing of those truths man has discovered in his search for the eternal and the infinite. The purpose of the author in writing this book seems to be stated in the introduction: "We expect to show that the position which should be taken by any one who is a true Christian and also a loyal citizen lies somewhere between these two extremes" (pacifism and militarism).

The study of the Old Testament brings the author to the conclusion that "There is, however, in the Scriptures no glorification of war or the warrior as such. On several occasions the Israelites were refused permission to take booty or to glory in their achievements. David, the foremost warrior in the Old Testament record, was forbidden to build the temple of Jehovah because he had shed so much blood. War was looked upon as a grim and terrible necessity in the hands of God for the restraint and punishment of national sins. It was to be avoided if possible, and never to be gloried in."

A study of war in the New Testament emphasizes the divine origin and approval of civic order and authority to maintain police and military protection. The book defends the principle that war is caused by sin. It presents a study of war symbolism in Scripture and hymnody. It has several brief chapters on Pacifist Pledges, Conscientious Objectors, the Modern Pacifist Movement, and Compulsory Military Training. It seems to the reviewer that the book is on the whole a defense of the proposition that war is a judgment of God upon the nations. It does point to the fact that the consequences of war are not all bad and that the government must not be obeyed blindly. The conclusion seems to be fairly presented in these sentences: "Only as the Prince of Peace rules in human hearts, and through them in the nations, will there be an end of strife between individuals and of wars between nations. We believe we are justified in saying that the greatest hindrance to the progress of Christianity today is, not any one of the pagan religions, not any false system of philosophy, nor the liquor traffic, nor any political system, but a *secular way of life* on the part of so many professed Christians, a way of life which often makes it impossible to see any difference between professed Christians and the people of the world."

Only a careful reading of the book will give an adequate idea of the treatment of the subject and rich content thereof.

H. D. HOOVER

The Preacher's Manual. By John H. C. Fritz. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941. 390 pages. \$3.

This book is, as the subtitle states, a study in Homiletics. Its three parts present: first a study of the art as well as the mechanics of preaching; secondly sermons, sermon studies, and outlines; and thirdly texts for various occasions, pericope systems and bibliography. The work impresses the reader as a thorough treatment of the subject. Its material is carefully and systematically organized and is characterized by a number of qualities that will commend it to the Lutheran preacher. Not the least important of these qualities is the author's insistence that preaching must have vital contact both with the Word of God and with the lives of men. He constantly urges that modern preaching recognize and meet modern conditions and needs.

Starting with his definition of the authority and purpose of preaching, "that God who has created and preserved us, and by His Word sanctifies all who believe in Him, be glorified," and insisting that the Gospel be preached in every sermon, the author develops a very complete system for the building of the sermon. The three homiletical requisites that he lays down are: (1) "A thorough study of the text," (2) "A good outline," (3) "A good delivery." The procedures for the building of the sermon are those usually recognized by the teachers of the art. Sermons are divided by Dr. Fritz into two types, the "direct or analytic" and the "indirect or synthetic." These methods of treatment are substituted for the usual types, topical, textual, and expository. For the author, the "direct or analytic" method includes both textual and expository treatment, and is the type which fulfills the highest ideal of preaching.

Step by step the progress of the building of the sermon is outlined with good counsel offered concerning the evil of "canned sermon material," the danger of dullness, and the value of "free delivery." Few phases of the work of preparing and delivering of sermons are neglected.

In many respects *The Preacher's Manual* is an interesting and helpful book. One would be an unfaithful reviewer did he fail to point out that the book will be more greatly appreciated by the particular group to which it is primarily addressed than by the general body of Christian believers. Many of its interpretations are frankly Missourian and colored or determined by the point of view of this group. It is somewhat dogmatic in the treatment of themes, and at times inaccurate. The interpretations of the parables of the "Laborers in the Vineyard" and the "Four Kinds of Soil" are forced, and not faithful to the Scriptures in an effort to accommodate them to the dogmas of the author's group.

The "History of Preaching" section, which the author characterizes as "A Brief Outline," is decidedly unsatisfactory, possibly because it must be only a brief outline. But it seems to this reviewer that it would have been better to have omitted this section entirely than to give such scant attention, or none at all, to the many great preachers whose contributions to the religious life and to our homiletical literature equaled or excelled those of the group mentioned, among whom German preachers of a comparatively early period predominate.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

A Pastor Wings Over South America. By Samuel Trexler. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1941. 113 pages. \$1.25.

This charming narrative of the author's visit to South America last year will be really helpful to readers who seek to bridge the gap between the usual missionary promotion literature and the secular books that deal in a more general way with the

countries where the mission fields are located. Dr. Trexler has not written an apologetic for Lutheran missions in South America, but his travelog does describe the missionary enterprise with sufficient perspective to enable the average reader to appraise the work fairly. The author is a competent guide. A seasoned world traveler of broad culture, he is in close touch with the missions which he surveyed, both as president of the Board of Foreign Missions, U.L.C.A., and as president of the mission-minded United Lutheran Synod of New York.

No statistical information is included, and the slender volume does not pretend to be a detailed study of the fields visited, but the book can well serve to arouse interest in mission study. The reviewer recommends it as an ideal gift for the busy layman who finds most missionary narratives dull or who claims to have little time for such reading. The propaganda *motif* is subdued and items of human interest abound in this record of a fifteen thousand mile trip of missionary inspection. There were six thousand miles by steamer from New York through the Panama Canal to Chile. Then followed nine thousand miles by the clippers, baby clippers and strato-clippers of Pan-American Airways, first from Chile across the Andes to Argentina and then back to New York City. Extended visits were made in the Argentina and British Guiana mission fields, shorter visits in Chile, Brazil, Trinidad, and Puerto Rico.

The author is discreet and discerning at all times, making shrewd observations in matters of which he is a competent judge, but carefully avoiding snap judgments about things that are best left to specialists in South American affairs. He writes with sufficient good humor and a most engaging style. The typography and binding are pleasing to the eye, with maps of the trip included in the inside front and back covers. The book comes dressed in an attractive jacket.

WILLIAM G. ARBAUGH

Then the Light Came. By Fred J. Fiedler. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1941. 203 pages. Paper, 60 cents.

This is designed as a mission study book for 1942, the centennial year of American Lutheran missions in India. The author, now engaged in the work of inner missions at Reading, Pennsylvania, is a former missionary of the United Lutheran Church to India (1921-1930). He writes, therefore, from personal knowledge about the Rajahmundry and Guntur fields. The ten chapters are written in the form of a tour surveying the work at its present stage. The descriptions are attractively done. The style is as lively and as engaging as good fiction while the material is factual throughout. Stress is laid upon Christian education and educational methods in the India mission, the work among the outcastes, native leadership, the ministry of healing and of mercy, and the prospects for the future. Chapter ten gives a broader treatment than the rest of the book by describing the Lutheran Federation in India and mentioning the work of other Lutheran bodies and societies, both European and American.

The book will aid its readers to visualize current methods of preaching, teaching, and evangelizing in India. Vivid stories of native workers convey something of the wonderful spirit of native Christianity at its best. There is little of historical retrospect except in chapter nine (the story of Father Heyer) and the chronological table given on pages 192-194. A valuable "List of All Missionaries in India" from 1842 on is appended with the synodical affiliation of each man and woman. It is not made clear whether this list is confined to persons who have served missions of the United Lutheran Church. There is a good map in five colors of the United Lutheran Church Mission and the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church. This can be obtained separately at a cost of twenty-five cents.

WILLIAM H. COOPER

The Deacon and Worship, A Study for Church Councilmen. By Amos John Traver. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1941. 64 pages. 20 cents a copy; \$1.75 a dozen.

Pastors who have successfully used H. H. Bagger's *Forty Thousand Strong* as a study book in church council meetings will be much pleased with the appearance of this second study. After one has summoned the courage to open its pages despite the title, one will find a practical little booklet covering the conduct of worship in the congregation and the councilmen's responsibilities in this field.

There is no subject more baffling to the average layman than worship. The author has been able to take the layman's point of view and bring the worship of the Lutheran Church into the understanding of the worshiper. Some of the subjects treated are: What Is Worship, Meeting the Common Service, Liturgical Whys, Responsibilities of the Councilmen, Christian Symbols, Music and Worship, Receiving the Sermon, The Holy Communion, Family and Personal Devotions, What Worship Does in Me.

For a booklet which is to explain the conduct and language of worship for the everyday church-goer, to have the word Deacon in its title seems to be a mistake. One feels that the gap between what a New Testament student and an average layman finds in the term is tremendous. It may keep many a person from reading what will certainly be a suggestive and broadening discussion booklet.

If this study book is to be regarded as a book of authority upon matters liturgical for councilmen, many a scholar will mourn. The author makes no effort to provide a scholarly handbook. But if the book is used, as it was intended, to awaken in the councilman a sense of the breadth of his responsibilities for congregational worship, and its power in the Christian life, it becomes a welcome addition to a series which certainly should be extended.

H. E. HORN

The Keeper of the King's Inn. By Robert Harris Gearhart, Jr. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1941. 75c.

Every year I am asked by pastors to recommend a new Christmas story. These stories come and go. Some remain; many disappear. But I venture to state that this story by Dr. Gearhart will live for many years to come. It begins in the days of Saul, the king. It ends with the coming of the Prince of Peace. Some material is fiction; some material is fact. But from the beginning of the story to the end thereof, the material is handled in an admirable manner. Beautifully written, at times approaching the poetical, it gives men the hope of the Prince of Peace in a manner which moves their hearts. This is not a book to be criticized; it is a book to be commended. It is a book to be commended for meditation in the family circle, alone, or in the moments of meditation.

The publisher has done an excellent job of make-up and printing. One illustration in color, others in black and white, are well placed. And children like pictures. The typography and form are good. Children like it. I tried it out on certain children. Adults like it, too. I commend this book without reservation as one of the finest Christmas books of modern times. Both author and publisher are to be congratulated. I like it very much, and I am sure others will like it also. This is not the place to tell the story; that should be discovered by each one for himself by reading the book.

W. R. SIEGART

The Lesson Commentary—1942. Edited by Charles P. Wiles. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1942. 319 pages. \$1.75.

This is the twentieth annual volume of practical expositions of the International Sunday School Lessons, edited by Dr. C. P. Wiles with the assistance of the Rev. Dan B. Bravin and Dr. Ralph D. Heim. As a Lutheran publication primarily for Lutheran use it is presented as additional material to that which is supplied by other publications. There is no duplication anywhere.

The lessons for the year include a six months' study of the Life of Christ according to the Synoptists, a three months' period devoted to considerations of Genesis, and a three month practical course dealing with the Christian life. The lessons of the first half of the year are rearranged to bring the schedule more in harmony with the Church Year. Each lesson includes a specific goal and plan. Likewise each lesson is introduced, interpreted, and applied in accordance with the plan. Geographical and historical material is bountifully supplied, and maps and pictures eliminate the necessity for other helps. The text is that of the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible (1929). The work is Scriptural, clear, concise, and practical. At least one copy should be available in each church school.

ROBERT D. HERSHEY

The Saving Presence. By Grover E. Swoyer. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1940. 155 pages. \$1.

Not to say anything profound or new in the field of scholarship or theological thought, but to present the truth that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God and that through Him alone can final peace and happiness come to men and nations," is Pastor Swoyer's purpose in this book. It is a book calculated for devotional reading. Pastors will find it helpful in bringing them into the mood of exalted and assured conviction necessary for persuasive preaching.

One is carried along through the early chapters of the book as the Saving Christ is exalted as the Son of God, miraculously present in human form by virgin birth, and working out the blood atonement on the Cross; we are led into the company of the suffering Christ, whose suffering began long before and was much deeper than the physical suffering of the last hours and the Cross; He is made of no reputation; although we see Him in Palestine as a giant of physical, mental, and spiritual strength, we see only a fraction of the glory he had with the Father; His exaltation is pictured as beginning with the Descensus, continuing through the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Second Advent. As the writer touches the various points of Christological doctrine in presenting the Master, there is repeated and strong insistence that the acceptance of a strictly conservative doctrinal position is essential to the true exaltation of Christ. If the Christian finds this hard to do, let him follow Dr. Stump's suggestion when he speaks thus of the Descensus: "How this occurred we should reserve until the other world, where not only this point but also others will be removed, which we here simply believe and cannot comprehend with our blind reason" (p. 87).

However, the preacher of more liberal leanings will find himself moved by this presentation of the Christ equally with his conservative brother. Doctrinal conservatism and scriptural authority are "musts," but the Christ is greater than the Book or the doctrine; He is the proof of the doctrine. The writer approves of Dr. Chas. A. Jefferson, who says there are doctrines he accepts "not through the New Testament, but through my observation of the power of Jesus and my experience of it in my own heart" (p. 36).

The writer is a master craftsman in his use of words. He uses this gift to exalt the Christ in many passages of great and incisive beauty. There are a few instances of overdoing a good thing. The last two chapters are disappointingly weak. One of them marshals a great array of witnesses from the worlds of public affairs, science, and literature—past and present—to prove that we are in good company in our exaltation of Jesus. After the able presentation in the earlier chapters, this strikes one as of the nature of anti-climax. The chapter on the imperatives for our Christian witness fails completely to live up to its title.

Thus it appears that there is some unevenness in the book. But it has this surpassing beauty: It takes the forms of a strict orthodoxy, which sometimes is a deadening thing, and uses them to exalt the living, compelling Christ. It is to the author more than a mere quotation when he concludes the chapter on the humiliation of Christ:—"Who would not follow when he heard His call?"

ARTHUR YEAGY

Prayer. By George A. Buttrick. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942. 333 pages. \$2.75.

This is not just another book on prayer. In all probability it will be *the* book on prayer for years to come, or at any rate until the forces which are weakening the prayer-life of Christians today have spent themselves and other forces appear which will make an entirely different approach necessary. But this is the book for the particular period through which we are passing now and which threatens to hold us in its grip for some time to come.

The twenty chapters of the book are grouped into four parts. Part I is entitled *Jesus and Prayer*. Here the author presents his thesis. It is that "man's knowledge has reached an impasse, his skill has become suicidal." There is a word which can return meaning and purpose and hope to life—the word God. But for many it has become a lost word. "And the way to know God? Is He best known 'face to face,' in the direct venture of prayer? Is there a postern gate into the immediate Presence? Jesus taught that faith and lived it."

This is the author's conviction. Our bewildered humanity will find no rest until it finds God. And the way to find God is through communion with Him in prayer. "Revival of faith can never come *from us*. It must come *from God*, in us and through us. It must come by prayer; and, indirectly, by testimony to prayer's light and power."

Parts II and III are devoted to meeting the difficulties which have their sources in the natural sciences and in psychology. Under the heading, *Prayer and the World*, the problems of petitionary and intercessory prayer are taken up and examined against the background of natural law. And under the heading, *Prayer and Personality*, the factors which are involved in mind-states and mind-processes receive full and adequate treatment. Among the nine chapters composing Part III, we find titles like these: *Prayer and Our Wandering Attention*; *Prayer, Suggestion, and Faith*; *Prayer, Memory, and the Subconscious*; *Personality and Prayer's Moods*.

Part IV is practical. There are chapters on *A Way of Private Prayer*, and on *A Way of Corporate Prayer*. The concluding chapter is entitled *Prayer and the New World*. Into the structure of the new world which is in the making will be woven the prayers of God's people. "The welfare of the race turns on events—events rightly interpreted and eliciting our right response. Prayer within the guiding friendship and parenthood of God has some power over events. Our world is not a realm of fixed law: it is a realm of spontaneity and surprise within a faithfulness. . . . The praying man turns the event—not always, not often, but sometimes. . . . If he turned it never, man would be a slave and God would be Coercion."

The mere recital of the chapter headings can give no adequate impression of the value of the book. It was necessary in order to make evident the comprehensive material which is included. But to the *what* of Dr. Buttrick's arguments must be added the *how* of his presentation. Dr. Buttrick has a unique style. In a lecture on Preaching we heard him advocate the cultivation of a diction in which usual words are linked in an unusual way. That describes his own style and the reader will agree that it is a style worth cultivating. Even old, familiar truths shine with a new lustre when expressed in usual words linked in an unusual way. And when to a vivid, picturesque style there is added an abundance of pertinent illustrations and choice quotations from the poets we have a book that makes delightful reading.

There is a third quality which characterizes the book. Not only is it rich in material and in literary form: it breathes a positiveness of faith which is refreshing in these days. One feels instinctively that the book is written out of a living experience. There is a poise and serenity even in the apologetic parts which can come only to one who has full knowledge of the strength of the opposition, yet finds his faith unshaken. Perhaps this constitutes one of the chief merits of the book. Dr. Buttrick cannot be accused of being an obscurantist. He knows the scientist's jealousy for an ordered universe and sympathizes with it. But within this ordered universe he still finds room for freedom, and it is to this freedom that he pins his faith in prayer.

The book is carefully documented. By printing the sources at the close of the book, the appearance of the text is made more inviting. A full index is also added.

E. E. FISCHER

We Are Not Divided. By John A. Hutchison. New York: The Round Table Press, 1941. 316 pages. \$3.00.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America represents almost 25,000,000 Christians in twenty-two denominations. As the author puts it, "The Federal Council was born of the marriage between the idea of social service and the idea of interdenominational coöperation." We find the roots or the conceptual period of interdenominational coöperation going back as far as Henry Melchior Muhlenberg in this country. Count Zinzendorf, Jonathan Edwards, and men like George Whitefield entertained the spirit of coöperation. The author gives the founder of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, Samuel Schmucker, a great deal of consideration for the part that he played in the coöperative movement. Liberal minds of the more liberal denominations led the way, so that by 1905 "thirty denominations assembled in conference at Carnegie Hall, New York, during the week of November 15-21."

The author clearly leads the reader to see the "winds of doctrine" that influenced the Federal Council's policy, depending upon whether the leadership was aggressive or militant. The Social Gospel received its momentum from the Council. But with the War of 1917-18 a world-wide problem presented itself and a crusade for brotherhood swept across the denominations in the Council. From the tragedy and experience of the World War the ecumenical movement was promoted through conferences and councils.

The author closes with an observation that brings joy to most of us. He sees the evangelical note being sounded in the preaching of the day. This could scarcely be centrifugal. It should be recognized as centripetal. The forces without have been recognized thoughtfully by the author. This book should be read by every young pastor and theologian. It is not argumentative, but historical, and that within the scope and day of the younger generations.

JOHN R. STREVIG

Norwegian Migration to America. The American Transition. By Theodore C. Blegen. Northfield, Minnesota: Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1940. 655 pages. \$3.50.

The story of the Norwegian element in the United States has in recent years been receiving the attention it deserves. The Norwegian-American Historical Association, which has been encouraging the collection of documents and the publication of scientific historical studies, is especially active in this respect. No other immigrant group of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has, in proportion to its numerical strength, received such thorough and sympathetic interpretation at the hands of professional historians. This may be due, on the one hand, to the fact that the study of the Norwegian element was begun later and with better methods than the study, for example, of the German element. On the other hand, however, it is due to the exceptionally capable scholars who have been attracted to this field of research.

One of these men is Dr. Theodore C. Blegen, dean of the graduate school in the University of Minnesota. His *Norwegian Migration to America, 1825-1860* (Northfield, 1931) depicted the European background of the immigrants and their early migrations. The author calls the present work "a companion volume" which "pictures the American transition of the Norwegian immigrant as the dynamic process it was." The purpose Dean Blegen set for himself is admirably fulfilled. Without unduly romanticizing them, he treats the struggles and sacrifices involved in adaptation to the New World. The immigrants had to adjust themselves in their manner of living, in their means of livelihood, in their language, in their religious life, and in other elements of their culture. They and their descendants gradually became American without ceasing to be conscious of their Norwegian heritage. Readers of this journal will be especially interested in Dean Blegen's treatment of the religious life and church affiliations of the Norwegian element in America. No direct factual additions are made to our knowledge of Lutheranism in America, but the Norwegian Lutherans are placed in the total setting of their life in America and, in this sense at least, our understanding of them is greatly enriched. Moreover, the Lutherans are seen in relation to some of their fellow Norwegians who became Quakers, Baptists, Mormons, Methodists, and Episcopalians. Most of the Norwegians—"in greater degree than the Swedes"—retained their Lutheran faith in America. But "the theological contentiousness of the Norwegians created a diversity within the general framework of the organized Lutheran Church which tended to accommodate a similar diversity of individual religious attitude and impulse and gave liberal scope to combative fervor."

This book is well written as well as balanced in its grasp. An appendix throws some additional light on the "Restoration" episode. The index is very full. The publishers have produced a handsome volume, furnished with illustrations of various kinds, and are to be commended for giving a suitable dress to an excellent work.

T. G. TAPPERT

BOOKS RECEIVED

For the information of its readers and in acknowledgment to the publishers, THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY publishes the following list of books received. More extended notice will be given to as many of them as space permits.

Howard B. Jefferson, *Experience and the Christian Faith*. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942. 230 pages. \$2.

Walter E. Schuette, *Keeping the Faith. Sermons for Special Occasions*. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, 1942. 227 pages. \$2.

Theodore Graebner, *The Gospel of St. Matthew* (The Annotated Pocket New Testament published by the Walther League). St. Louis: Concordia Publication House, 1942. Paper, 80 pages. 25 cents.

Gerald B. Smith, *Principles of Christian Living*. Revised by Leland Foster Wood. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1942. 280 pages. \$2.

Raymond Calkins, *How Jesus Dealt with Men*. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942. 214 pages. \$1.75.

Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism*. New York: Macmillan, 1941. 694 pages. \$3.50.

Paul Z. Strodach, ed., *Calling All Christians and Other Sermons on the Proper Gospels of the Lenten Season*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942. 259 pages. \$1.75.

Andrew W. Blackwood, *Evangelism in the Home Church*. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942. 160 pages. \$1.

Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Regular Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Assembled at Fort Wayne, Indiana, June 18-27, 1941. St. Louis: Concordia, 1941. Paper, 448 pages. 85 cents.

T. A. Kantonen, *The Message of the Church to the World of Today*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1942. \$1.50.

A. Fibiger, *A Study of the Passion of Christ*. Translated by Olaf Lynses. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1942. 293 pages. \$2.

Paul Zeller Strodach, *Were You There? Some of the Folk Who Were*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942. 291 pages. \$1.50.

Ralph W. Sockman, *The Highway of God*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1942. 228 pages. \$2.

William Paton, *The Church and the New Order*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1941. 188 pages. \$1.50.

E. Theodore Bachmann, *They Called Him Father. The Life Story of John Christian Frederick Heyer*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942. 342 pages. \$1.75.

Theodore G. Tappert, *The Church Through the Ages*. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1941. 144 pages. Paper, 50 cents.

*A Book on Public Speaking Which Should Be in
Every Pastor's Library*

HOW SHALL I SAY IT ?

*Ross
H.
Stover*

This work represents the culmination of knowledge of the technique of public speaking gained by the author through years of practical experience as an eminent preacher, radio and platform speaker and highly acclaimed professor of public speaking.

The mechanics of speech are vividly revealed in chapters dealing with: Posture; Breathing; Voice; Articulation; Gesture; Fervency; Touches of Excellence; Speech Formulas. Quite the reverse of an academic discussion, the principles of effective public speaking are here stated in a concise manner that is easily comprehended.

Abundant study and reference aids are included. Illustrations abound. Helpful exercises are given. Key points and sub-topics are emphasized in the margins. Type arrangement focuses attention immediately on subject matter.

Only \$1.00

The United Lutheran Publication House

THIRTEENTH AND SPRUCE STREETS, PHILADELPHIA

CHICAGO

COLUMBIA

PITTSBURGH